

THE
AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
HOMŒOPATHY.

EDITED BY S. R. KIRBY, M.D.

THE AGITATION OF THOUGHT IS THE BEGINNING OF TRUTH.

VOL. VII.

New-York:
POLYGLOT PRINTING OFFICE,
No. 12 Frankfort Street.

1853.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VII.

	PAGE		PAGE
A Medical Consultation, ...	9	Fiery Indignation, ...	110
A few Thoughts about Homœopathic Periodicals, ...	12	Homœopathy, ...	15, 16, 75, 119
Allopathists, ...	15	Homœopathists, ...	16
American Institute of Homœopathy, ...	16	Homœopathic Medical Society of	
Address by Dr. Kirby, ...	21	the State of New-York, ...	29, 132, 155
Address to Homœopathic Physi-		Homœopathic Practice, ...	33, 90
cians, by Dr. J. Jeans, ...	27	“ Hospital in N. Y., ...	39, 56, 69
American Magazine, ...	38	“ Medical College	
Anecdote, ...	39	of Pa., ...	49, 167
A few Rambling Thoughts, ...	65	Homœopathist vs. Allopathist, ...	56, 86, 95
An Essay of Homœopathic Statis-	92	Homœopathists are not at Liberty	
tics, ...	92	to disregard their Principles, ...	67
A few Thoughts on Consumption, ...	125, 152	Homœopathic Congress, ...	77
Allopathic Hospitals in Spain, ...	133	Homœopathic Medical Convention, ...	95
Bradford Infirmary, Election of Sur-		Homœopathic Intelligence, ...	113
geons, ...	105	How to Judge a System of Medi-	
Bethlehem Hospital, ...	111	cine, ...	119
Benevolent—very, ...	117	Homœopathic Manual of Obstetrics, ...	120
Cases, ...	13	Homœopathic Times, ...	133
Children's Hospital, ...	33	Homœopathy and Young Physic,	
Case of Albuminuria, ...	63	134, 149, 153	
Code of Ethics, ...	76	How to Decide which Mode of	
Clairvoyance, ...	87	Practice to Adopt, ...	140
Case of Neuralgia, ...	130	Homœopathic Treatment of Yellow	
Cases should be Recorded, ...	132	Fever, ...	141
Cure me Quickly, ...	143	Letter from Justice, ...	15
Differences among Homœopathic		“ from Dr. J. C. Raymond, ...	21
Practitioners, ...	104	“ from Homœopathia Revealed, ...	50
Extracts of Letters to the Editor, ...	48	“ from Dr. D. M. Dake, ...	83
Euthanasia, ...	88	Lecture on Homœopathy, by Dr.	
Every Man and every Woman a		Holland, ...	165
Doctor, ...	120	Monthly Report of N. Y. Homœo-	
Established Rules in Medicine		pathic Dispensary, ...	32
should be strictly followed in		Medical Treatment of Horses, ...	48
Practice, ...	129	Magnitude and Repetition of Doses,	
Error Corrected, ...	184	by <i>Hahnemann</i> , ...	107
		Medical Gazette, ...	133
		Michigan Journal of Homœopathy, ...	16

Nelson's Northern Lancet, ...	31	Short Comings of the old system— the new system better, ...	73
Northern Homœopathic Medical As- sociation, ...	57	To Correspondents, ...	15, 40
Notable Scraps, ...	65	The Question Settled—Homœo- pathists Annihilated, ...	75
Observations on the Three Current Methods of Treatment, ...	1, 17	The Medical Treatment of the Duke of Wellington, ...	75
Objections to the Journal, ...	14	The Cholera at Posen, ...	95
On the Use of High Attenuations in Homœopathic Practice, ...	25, 41	The Regulars, ...	111
On the Observation of Nature in the Treatment of Diseases, 81, 101, 114		The Preparation of Drugs, etc., ...	116
Opium in <i>Delirium Tremens</i> , ...	117	The Responsibility of the Physi- cians, etc., ...	117
Philadelphia Jour. Homœopathy, ...	16	The Aggravation of Diseases, etc., ...	131
Professional Ignorance—on which side is it, ...	31	The Means by which Diseases are Cured, not always known, ...	151
Proceedings of Amer. Institution of Homœopathy, ...	35	The small Doses, etc., ...	156, 169
Periodicals received, ...	55	The Force of Evidence alone leads to Faith in Homœopathy, ...	163
Progressive Homœopathy forever, ...	66	The Opposition—its Tendency, ...	166
Progress of Homœopathy, etc., ...	108	The People must Aid, etc., ...	173
Phenomena and Theory of Inflam- mation, ...	126, 145	Three Precautionary Rules of Hah- nemann, ...	174
Reform in Medicine Progressing, ...	107	To Subscribers, ...	184
Suggestions to the Homœopathic School, ...	5	University of the City of New-York, ...	50
Short Abstract of Cases in the N. Y. Homœopathic Dispensary, ...	7	“ of Berlin, ...	111
Serpent Charmers, ...	10	What is Homœopathy, ...	51
Stray Notes, ...	44	Words to the Wise, ...	62, 85
Specimen of Allopathic Practice, ...	45	Whom the Gods, etc., ...	168
		View of Professional Liberality, etc., ...	137

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, MAY, 1852.

NO. 1.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE THREE CURRENT METHODS OF TREAT- MENT.

BY S. HAHNEMANN.

TREATMENT OF THE CAUSE.

*Treatment founded on the internal essence
of the disease.*

In a practically useful point of view we may divide diseases in general into two classes; diseases having a visible, simply material cause, and diseases having an immaterial dynamic cause.

The first class, the diseases having an obvious, simple, material cause, such as a splinter stuck in the finger, a stone swallowed, a concretion in the biliary ducts or the bladder, an accumulation of plum-stones in the cœcum, an acrid acid in the stomach, a fragment of the skull pressing on the brain, a too-prolonged frenum to the tongue, &c., are much less numerous than the diseases of the second class.

The indication for treatment is obvious. All are agreed that it consists in the removal of the material cause, be that mechanical, be it merely chemical, or a mixture of both. This generally suffices to effect a cure, provided no considerable destruction of the organ has occurred.

Its consideration does not concern us at present.

We shall occupy ourselves with *the mode of curing the second class of diseases*, the countless array of all other diseases properly so called of an acute, sub-acute, and chronic character, together with the numerous ailments, indispositions, and abnormal states, having *an immaterial dynamic cause*.

It is the natural tendency of the human mind to seek for the exciting causes of the phenomena he sees about him, and hence we see, that no sooner does a disease show itself, than every one occupies himself with attributing it to some source, that which seems to him to be the most likely one. But we should be greatly mistaken if, from this irresistible propensity to seek a cause for an effect, we should infer a necessity for such knowledge in order to effect a cure.

For very few diseases of the latter class do we know the dynamic cause even by name, of none do we know the nature. Into the secrets of nature *no created mind can penetrate*. And yet as regards diseases, it is imagined that both can be known. The ordinary physician has this in common with the generality of people, that he imagines he can assign an exciting cause for every perceptible alteration in the health, and those physicians who were apparently the wisest, imagined that they could penetrate even to the internal essence of diseases, and that they were thereby enabled to cure them.

Owing to the very nature of the thing, it is impossible that the essential nature of most of the dynamic causes derived from without can ever be ascertained.

How much have not some attempted to demonstrate to us respecting the influence of the seasons and of the various states of the weather, as exciting causes of diseases! We were told of the variations in the thermometer and barometer, the various winds, and the alternations of moisture and dryness of the atmosphere for a whole year, or at least for several months, before the occurrence of an epidemic, and the murderous disease was attributed, quite off-hand and without much consideration, to the weather that prevailed during all that long period, just as if the disease could be derived from the state of the weather, or as if they bore the relation to one another of cause and effect. But granting that there was something in this, at least in the variations of the seasons, as the cause, or at least partly the cause of particular kinds of diseases, how little comfort can the physician derive from these *unalterable* accompaniments of the world's course, how little assistance do they render him in proving the indications from which he can bid defiance to the epidemic actually prevailing! Were the season of the year and the previous state of the weather really the cause of the prevailing distemper, it would avail him little or nothing to know this, seeing that from this cause the specific remedy for the pestilence cannot be deduced, cannot be decyphered.

Fright, fear, horror, anger, vexation, a chill, &c., are impressions that do not present themselves in a concrete form, that cannot be subjected to physical investigation.

How and to what extent these impressions

derange the human system, what especial kind of disease they produce in it, is so entirely unknown to us, that we obtain not the slightest hint for the treatment of the diseases they give rise to, by being informed of the names of their probable source—fright, fear, vexation, anger, &c. The most abstract investigation into the metaphysical nature of fright affords the physician no instruction relative to the proper treatment of its effects, never expresses the name of the appropriate remedy of the acute symptoms arising from fright—the name of *opium*. This is not the place to indicate the shorter, more natural way by which this remedy has been discovered for these accidents.

It is very easy to say, that we may attribute itch to the itch miasm, the venereal disease to the venereal miasm, variola to the variolous miasm, ague to the marsh miasm. By pronouncing these names not the slightest advance is made to obtaining a more accurate knowledge of these diseases, nor yet to their appropriate treatment. The morbidic miasms are as thoroughly unknown to us as regards their internal nature, as the diseases themselves they produce. Their essential nature is quite beyond the reach of our senses, and their true remedies will never be learned from what the schools can teach us regarding their exciting causes. All that has been discovered relative to their remedies has been discovered by mere accident, by unpremeditated experience. But the way to seek for them purposely and to find them will never be deducible from aught we can ascertain respecting the internal cause of the disease.

What amount of knowledge respecting the cause and essential nature of *endemic* diseases would suffice to reveal to us their true remedies? For us weak mortals there will ever remain an impassable gulf betwixt such a fancied knowledge and the remedy. Reason will never discover a logical connexion betwixt the two! Were even a God to enlighten us in regard to the invisible alterations produced in the interior of the minutest portions of our body by the miasm of that most tedious, periodical endemic disease that prevails in a portion of Lunenburg and Brunswick—the *water-kulk* (water-colic) as it is termed, which the eye of the practised anatomist cannot discover, and were our mind, that is cognisant only of sensuous impressions, capable of understanding such transcendental instruction, this intuitive knowledge would never guide us to the discovery of the only specific and infallible remedy—the *veratrum album*. But this is not the place to show the shorter, more natural way in which the remedy for this disease may be sought and found.

Neither the name of goitre, nor its probable cause (a residence in mountain valleys) whispers to our mind the name of its remedy, which was revealed by mere accident—the burnt sponge.

Why then should we falsely and proudly pretend that we can cure diseases from our knowledge of their dynamic causes?

For the accidents and diseases produced by commercial and pharmaceutic poisons the appropriate remedies have partially been discovered, but it was neither speculative investigation into the internal nature of these diseases nor physico-chemical analysis of their cause—the poisons—that taught us these specific antidotes, but a much shorter procedure, and one much more consonant with nature. It is not very long since these hurtful substances were attempted to be removed, often with very unhappy results, by emetics, diluent drinks or purgatives, as if they oppressed the stomach and bowels in a merely mechanical manner. Now, we know how to combat many of them like morbidic causes of the second class, of dynamic nature, by their appropriate antidotes. They effect an alteration of the whole system in a peculiar, to us unknown manner, and their effects can never be cured like mere local mechanical irritations, as was formerly imagined.

Others went much more learnedly to work, and divided them, in an entirely apodictic manner, just as though they had been inspired thereto by a God, into acrids, narcotics, narcotico-acrids, &c., and agreeably to this arbitrary classification, dictated their remedies in an equally arbitrary manner;—*a true picture of the mode of procedure of the schools, classifying natural diseases, and assigning the remedies for them!* Arbitrariness, conceited arbitrariness, and self-satisfied pride!

Thus belladonna and nuxvomica were, with arbitrary despotism, ranked among the narcotic poisons, and the vegetable acids, lemon juice and vinegar, were cavalierly appointed their antidotes. Unfortunately for them, their assumed omniscience could here be put to an infallible test, and their error detected in the very act. It was proved that vegetable acids were the very substances that most aggravated the symptoms. *And so it will usually be found, that the very opposite of what they assert is often the truth.*

Sed saeculorum commenta delet dies.

It never could have entered into the imagination of this church beyond whose pale there is no salvation, to assign opium as the antidote of the one, camphor as that of the other of these powerful substances, as experience has shewn to be the case.

But they were not content with dragging in as it were by the ears, or inventing external causes for diseases, or with arbitrarily attributing to them some peculiar nature, and, I cannot say searching for (for one can only search for a thing when there are well-grounded traces and indications of its existence), but rather imagining and inventing remedies directed against this supposed nature.

They went still more learnedly to work, and concocted in their brains all sorts of *internal causes* of diseases.

The ambitious notion that they were capable of referring most diseases to one or a couple of internal causes, now became the origin of the many sects among physicians, each successive one of which was more fantastic than its predecessor.

One of these, and that not the worst, expressed the in some degree special life and the peculiarities and particular actions of each individual organ, by the figurative name of an *Archæus*, a kind of particular spirit of this or that part, and imagined that when this or that part suffered they required to soothe its particular *Archæus*, and give its thoughts another direction. It appears to me that they meant to make a confession of the incomprehensibility of all the phenomena of disease, and a confession of their inability to satisfy the requirements of these supernatural things.

Others thought to persuade us that a predominance of acid was the proximate cause of all diseases, and they prescribed nothing but alkalies. An attempt to ally itself with them was made by the old sect, which referred all kinds of acute diseases, especially the epidemic maladies, to a common poison which they contended often developed itself in the interior of the body, and sought for the antidote of this poison, which they believed to be the general excitant of most diseases, in absorbent alkaline earths, but especially in the stony concretions found in the stomach of an antelope (bezoar) and in the most heating spices mixed with opium (mithridate, theriac, philonium, &c.). Their abuse of the earthy powders has extended down to modern times, and their evil demon, the empirical universal abuse of opium, has now possessed some sects of the present time, who have thought of other reasons for their misapplication of this remedy for special cases as a positively universal remedy.

C. L. Hoffmann imagined that he had an equal right to set forth as a universal truth his own particular notion that almost all diseases arose from a kind of putridity, and were to be cured with remedies which his school denominates antiseptics.

No one will question his right any more than they will that of the other leaders of sects, who perceived in diseases nothing but acridities in the blood; demonstrated these for our edification by far fetched, scholastic arguments, and in an off-hand manner at once invented the remedies for the black bile, for the psoric, arthritic, scrofulous, rachitic, muriatic and God knows what other kinds of imaginary acridities, until the moderns, unmindful of the *medio tutissimus*, founded a religion equally exaggerated in the opposite direction, in which the fluids were entirely banished from the list of morbid causes, and the production of disease was attributed to the solids alone.

In this way the poor diseases were ascribed now by this pig-headed fellow and now by that, at one time to this, at another to that cause. All this time they remained in quiet

possession, and never suffered themselves to be disturbed.

Let it not be supposed that on the whole more diseases were cured by one sect than by another. To excogitate causes of diseases, speculative modes of their production, and to found systems thereon, were what was aimed at; but not to cure them. The former undertaking exalts the artist much nearer the stars than the latter, and thus diseases remained just as before, uncured, except such of them as would get as well of their own accord, that is, under any arbitrary treatment whatsoever.

The doctrine of bad humours long enchained mankind, the dominion of acridities and perverted juices long prevailed. But as the specific anti-acridity remedies could not so readily be found out, the whole joke usually and principally consisted in producing evacuations. With the exception of a few empirical drinks and several kinds of mineral waters prescribed at haphazard, which the humoral physician commanded to enter the blood, to sweeten it, to correct it, and to expel by sweat and urine the impure parts of it separated from the good portion as if by magic, the principal manœuvre of the humoral school consisted in the evacuation of the bad blood (bleeding mania) and in the expulsion of the impure fluids by the mouth and anus (stercoralism, saburralism).

How? did they pretend to let out the impure blood only? What magician's hand could separate, as through a sieve, the depraved from the good blood within the blood-vessels, so that only the bad would be drawn off and the good remain? What head is so rudely organised as to believe that they could effect this? Sufficient for them that streams of blood were spilt, of that vital fluid for which even Moses shewed so much respect, and that justly.

The more refined humoralists, in addition to the impurities in the blood, alleged besides the existence of a pretended, almost universal plethora, as an excuse for their frightful, merciless blood-lettings; they also gave out that these acted derivatively, depressed the tone, and ascribed many other subtle scientific effects to them. They acted, as we see, like other sects, quite arbitrarily, but obviously with an endeavour (not indeed to cure, that would be vulgar, no!) to give to their arbitrary procedures the highest possible colouring of rationality.

Reasons equally excellent, aims equally sage, had the humoral-saburral physicians for their innumerable emetics and their strong and mild purgatives. "Consider the quantity of impurities that are thereby purged from the blood, only look at the contents of the chamber utensil! When all that has been removed, then the body will be purified from all bad humours. Consider, moreover, what a quantity of impurities must daily remain and collect in the body from the food and drink we

take in ;—it must be purged away, and that repeatedly, if we do not wish the patient to die. Observe also how most patients complain of tense or at all events painful abdomen, or at least of unnaturally shaped hypochondria, furred tongue and bad taste ; who can fail to perceive from these signs that the germs of all fevers, the actual cause of all diseases, lie in the impurities of the first passages ? Yes, we must certainly purge, and that frequently and strongly, in order to bring away the material cause of the disease. The excellence of our method is shewn by this, that we are in high estimation as skilful physicians. The patient feels that he gets a good equivalent for his money, he perceives how the medicine acts on his body, and he sees with his own eyes the impurities that are expelled from him ! Who can deny that all this speaks to the convictions of the people, who can doubt that our church alone holds the true faith ?”

“I cannot quite agree with you, brother,” says another branch of the saburral school, “when you ascribe all diseases to the bile. I maintain that they all depend upon the phlegm in the first passages. The phlegm must be energetically cut into, diligently dissolved ; the phlegm, I say, must be properly purged away, in order to extirpate the disease by the roots. All your bilious and putrid fevers are masked pituitous fevers, all conceivable diseases now-a-days depend upon phlegm, and if patients treated according to our method are long in recovering, we yet can boast of our system that it is radical and lucrative.”

Thus would Blennophilos (in the style of his whole art) descant still more discursively upon the advantages of his system, whilst Eucholos, greatly displeased at hearing the bile denied to be the universal cause of diseases, could not refrain from making an equally vigorous speech in defence of bile, which demands a general employment of emetics and purgatives. “Bile, bile must be expelled,” was the conclusion of his philippic, “diligently and universally, upwards and downwards must it be expelled, for it is the originating cause of all diseases !”

Accordingly the poor world was for more than half a century properly cleared out upwards and downwards, so that any one must have thought that it was thoroughly cleansed of all impurities. All a mistake, said Kämpf they are not nearly enough dissolved and purged, at least they have not had half enough of the only efficacious process from below. The source of all diseases has been sought for in an entirely wrong place. Whence proceed the many hundreds of hypochondriacal and hysterical nervous diseases, the hitherto mysterious chronic diseases of the better classes, whence all the pulmonary, hepatic, splenic, cutaneous and cephalic diseases, and I may say all other diseases, whence do they all proceed if not from infarctus and lodgments in the abdomen ? By means of solvent clysters in hundreds must these be dissolved and

purged away if we wish to avert death. Heavens ! how purblind the world has been not to have discovered before now, this the only possible remedy for the only possible cause of all diseases ! And verily, there could scarcely be a more lucrative method for the practitioner ; by no other could he so beautifully get over the difficulties of his indications as by this, by which, without requiring to give any further reason, holding up the fearful talisman of infarctus in order to work uncontrolled in the dark, beyond the ken of the common sense of the uninitiated, and with the hocus-pocus of several hundred clysters (composed of a number of unintelligible ingredients) he could—how wonderful !—bring bodily to light the dreaded infarctus in all its hideous deformity. Making omelettes in a hat is child’s play to this.

If, sighed Tyro, I only knew all the external signs by which lodgments could be diagnosed in any human being, if I only knew what infarctus really is, what part of the intestines (of so many, of almost all persons !) is constituted so torpid, as to harbour in such an imperceptible manner these Protean masses, and what causes their greyish colours, their various shapes, consistences, and odours, as they are to be found arranged in a tabular form in Kämpf’s work ! The difficulties of the subject make me quite ill ! since there are no sure external signs of their existence, who can tell whether some such horrors do not lurk in my own entrails !

Grieve not, dear Tyro ! that your five senses are inadequate to enable you to discover all this. The game of infarctus and infarctus-clysters is already played out. It was only a financial manœuvre, if it was not a pious self-deception of the inventor. By a succession of clysters we may make the bowels of even the healthiest peasant into an organ for the production of unnatural fæces, of masses of mucus of every variety of form and colour.

Other modern visionaries attributed almost all diseases they could not cure to a step-sister of the infarctus, I mean to obstruction in the minutest vessels of the abdomen. They have not mentioned any signs by which this may *with certainty* be recognised. Here, therefore, was another subject of panic terror for the poor easily frightened patients, another rich draught of fish in the dark ! But be comforted ! They immediately discovered in their nightcap the most effectual remedies for it. The vast number of mineral waters and baths that still continue daily to gush forth from the bosom of the earth to the great advantage of the presiding physicians of each watering-place, which, like the waters of Bethesda, are good (we know not how) for all conceivable maladies, must consequently be also capable of clearing away the obstructions of the finest vessels of the abdomen and of the mesenteric glands—*id quod erat demonstrandum*. Moreover, the saponaria, the taraxa-

cum, the antimonial medicines, especially the antimonial soaps, invented in defiance of all chemistry, as they become spoilt in an hour, soap itself, ox-gall, the tritium repens, and above all, ye, our more than harrow and plough, noble *neutral salts*, known to us at least by name! What can resist your solvent powers!

Bravely spoken!

But have you ever witnessed, whether and how they perform this solvent action? What divine revelation has pointed them out to you as solvent remedies, since experience teaches nothing thereof to our senses, can shew no proofs of it—since all is hidden from our view? Are you convinced of the existence of your imaginary obstructions? Are you aware that Sömmering found the enlarged glands, which you consider obstructed, actually the most pervious to injections of mercury? Do you know that when you successfully employed muriate of baryta, or muriate of lime in some cases of scrofulous disease, you did not dissolve, as you fondly dreamt, but only separated the saccharine acid in them, discovered by Fischer, which was the cause of the tumefaction in the glands? Where, now, are your obstructions? Of what value are your solvent remedies, seeing that there is nothing to dissolve?

(To be continued.)

SUGGESTIONS TO THE HOMŒOPATHIC SCHOOL.

We now enter upon the editorial labor of the seventh year of this Journal. The doctrine we have advocated has been approved by those of our colleagues whose judgment, learning, experience and integrity not only command our respect, but also that of the people among whom they reside. In the main our course has been commended by those competent to judge of the matter. Being thus encouraged it is our purpose to be more diligent, and make the American Journal of Homœopathy still more worthy the consideration of those who believe the immutable principles developed by the immortal Hahnemann. We announce at the very outset of this seventh volume, that we shall continue to the utmost of our ability to advocate Homœopathy as taught by the great master, and show less favor than we have ever yet done to mongrelism, eclectism and allopathy.

Hahnemannian Homœopathy, which by the by is the only Homœopathy yet promulgated, although much is propagated in her name which is in fact but Allopathy, has never disappointed our reasonable expectations, and we will answer for it, nor those of any other

practitioner. We avow most distinctly that we shall not cease to advocate the "*small doses*," the attenuated drugs, from the 3d to the 30th, and higher.

The evidence of the efficacy of these attenuations is too convincing to leave a doubt in our mind that they are the most safe and certain in the cure of diseases. Our colleagues will pardon us, we know, for we have avoided heretofore speaking of our own practice in the columns of this Journal, but for this once we will say, that for years past we have rarely employed drugs in the treatment of diseases in less than the 30th attenuations, and we do know that (we speak it for the honor of Homœopathy) our success has exceeded that practice in our neighborhood in which the mother-tinctures and low attenuations were relied on. We shall of course have occasion again and again to refer to the subject of doses, and will not extend our remarks in this article.

With the means at our command, we have had an eye to the practice of Physicians of our School in this country, and we are happy in being able to state that genuine homœopathic practice is gradually working its way among practitioners, and as a consequence among the people. We are also able to state, that in numerous instances, where practitioners like a barber undertook to shave both sides, that is, practice Homœopathy and Allopathy as customers might designate, the practice itself was unsuccessful, and of course failed to secure the confidence of the people, and was treated by them with not only neglect but contempt.

We shall continue to urge the study of Hahnemann's Organon of homœopathic medicine—a work not yet thoroughly understood; and the same may be said of his work on chronic diseases.

We believe the period is at hand when it will be found politic, nay more, absolutely necessary, for a line of distinction to be drawn between those who practice in all cases pure Homœopathy and those who do not. In our humble opinion it cannot be otherwise than pernicious for genuine Homœopaths to mix themselves before the public with those who are not. We cannot reconcile it with discretion, nor with wisdom, nor with honesty, for those who, after mature reflection and experience, are thoroughly convinced that the

doctrine and practice of Hahnemann are true, to give countenance in any way to mongrelism and eclectism, which are allopathic. Our course in this respect seems to us perfectly consistent with a true spirit of liberality. It deprives no man of his just rights. It places every man before the public in his real professional character. It should not cause any unholy feeling among practitioners personally. It leaves every man free to follow the convictions of his own mind, and advocate and practice what he believes to be true; and it protects the public from imposition. The sum of the whole matter is this, we think the period has arrived when pure homœopaths should be careful not to place themselves in such relations as will, to the public, endorse mongrels, eclectics and allopaths as genuine homœopathic practitioners.

Now, if such practitioners are honest and wise, and sufficiently intelligent to be actuated by a love of truth in the science and art of medicine, they cannot object to these views, but on the contrary approve them. For, if they hold the truth in medicine, genuine homœopaths do not; and therefore the latter are but an unprofitable incumbrance to the former: and *vice versa*. Hence a separation is desirable for both. We shall not apologise for this bold declaration of our views.

We see no necessity in this day for pure homœopaths to adopt a policy inconsistent with their principles; they have fixed principles upon which they can rely, and the only true policy for them is, to strictly adhere to those principles in all circumstances. We contend, that to the present time, no one understands Homœopathy as well as did Hahnemann, and probably for years to come his *Organon* and his *Materia Medica Pura* must be the acknowledged standards of the homœopathic school. He has given to the world a complete system, made up of principles that are immutable. The homœopathic school can and ought to claim that she is constituted by a complete science for the art of healing. Now what we contend for is, that in the *art* of healing there should be the most strict observance of those established laws of nature which constitute the science of medicine as promulgated by Hahnemann. In this way, and in this way only, can the art of healing be improved.

How is it possible for any one who doubts

the principles which constitute the science of medicine, to habitually make those principles a guide in his practice? It may be possible, yet we think it rarely the case. We assert for a fact, capable of being established as much so as its nature admits of, that the pure homœopaths are the only practitioners who are habitually guided by fixed principles in the treatment of diseases. They never rely upon experience apart from the law; if they do, they are out at sea without a rudder or a compass, and are carried about by every wind of doctrine. Thus it is with mongrels, and with eclectics, and with allopaths.

In one thing the Allopathic School is consistent. It seeks to separate itself from the Homœopathic, in its societies and associations. This to our mind is reasonable, and there should be no complaining of the course of that school in this respect. We look upon that school as honest in its purposes; for no one doubts but men sincerely sustain error. So it is with allopaths, and they believe it to be their duty to exclude homœopaths from their communion, who they think hold pernicious doctrines.

It is the custom of the times, and for aught we know always has been so, for those who agree in certain principles on any subject to associate together, and if any member habitually does anything inconsistent with the admitted principles by which the association is united, he voluntarily withdraws, or he is expelled, or he loses caste among his fellows. This course of conduct among men is so natural in every man's views and feelings, that it exists even in the loosened organizations of political parties. Therefore, so far as our own views and feelings govern us, we are for union of form, as it is already in fact, of pure homœopaths in a way that shall by precept and example exhibit to the world that the science of medicine is complete, and that the art of medicine is not that uncertain guess-work that many now suppose. Our readers will now we trust understand our position, which is the same we have tried to hold from the commencement of this Journal.

Dr. Kirby has removed to No. 72 Tenth Street, one door east of Fifth Avenue. All communications relating to the business of this Journal may be directed as above, or to Messrs. Angell, Engel & Hewitt, Publishers, No. 1 Spruce Street.

SHORT ABSTRACT OF A FEW OF THE CASES TREATED AT THE NEW-YORK HOMŒOPATHIC DISPENSARY.

Dr. BOLLES. 1. *Mrs. D.*, æt. 47. Chronic constipation, scybalaë, with pain and straining. *Nux* 6, *Sulph.* 30. Bowels regular while taking the medicine.

2. *James C.*, æt. 3. Dry cough, more or less, all winter. *Phos.* 30. In a week, cough almost gone.

3. *Mrs. C.* Pain in back for seven months, scanty urine and dropsy of feet. *Colch.* 3, *Iod. Pot.* 1. Urine increased and dropsy disappeared in a week. *Ledum* 30. Pain in back ceased in a week more.

4. *Miss Mary P.* Salt rheum in face for more than a year. *Rhus* 30. Improvement in a week; almost well in two months.

5. *Mrs. Mary P.*, æt. 44. Pain in stomach and dyspepsia for two years, with bloating of face. *Ars.* and *Cham.*, *Nux* 6, *Rhus* 24. Was perfectly well in two weeks, and remained so, at last accounts, three months after.

6. *Hannah D.*, æt. 45. Painful diarrhœa for a week. *Phos.* 30, *Secal.* 30. Ceased immediately on taking medicine.

7. *Miss D.* Suppression of menses for a year. *Kreosot* 30. Menses re-appeared after three doses.

8. *Bridget C.* Permanent swelling and dropsy of feet, after being frozen. *Agaricus* 3. Almost well in two weeks.

9. *Mary M.* Inflammation of breast for a week, with swelling of glands of arm-pit. *Bry.* 3, *Merc.* 3. Well in two weeks.

10. *Catharine G.*, æt. 36. Chronic headache, with burning on top of head; dizziness, heat and redness of face. *Bell.* 30, *Carb-v.* 30, relieved her from May 8 to August 28.

11. *Mrs. B.* Chronic rheumatism, of four years' standing. *Ledum* 30 and *Merc-v.* 3 produced marked relief from July 3d to October 2d.

12. *Mrs. Catharine R.* Chronic headache for years on left side of face and head, after salivation for cholera in 1832. *Nitr-ac.* 3 relieved from July 24 to December 11 and after.

13. *Wm. D.*, æt. 15. Rheumatism for three days; had a similar attack two years ago, that, under allopathic treatment, confined him to the house for six weeks. Well in a week.

14. *Patrick H.*, æt. 3½ years. Ill for five weeks with daily paroxysms of fever, at noon, consisting of heat followed by warm perspiration. *Acon.* 3, *Ars.* 3. No fever after first day of taking the medicine.

Dr. KIRBY. 15. *John McE.*, æt. 44. Costiveness; goes four, five or seven days. *Nux* 30, without benefit—then *Opium* 3. Reported himself regular for four weeks, during which he used it.

16. *Sarah J.*, æt. 22. Expectoration of blood and thick yellow phlegm, fever and night sweats, hacking cough. *Phos.* 30. Was nearly well in three weeks.

17. *Mary O.*, æt. 33. Burning in stomach, pain after eating, waterbrash and costiveness, pain in region of womb, with yellow leucorrhœa. *Nux* 30, and *Bell* 30. Three weeks after, the majority of symptoms were removed.

18. *Chester S.*, æt. 43. Dysentery, with ten or fifteen bloody passages per day. *Merc-v.* 3. Nine days after, reported he had only a little soreness in lower bowel, with a passage from bowels only every two or three days.

19. *John C.*, æt. 68. Dyspeptic for two years, bitter eructations and heart-burn. *Arsen.* and *Nux.* In three weeks reported himself cured.

Dr. STEWART. 20. *Catharine Jane V.*, æt. 10. St. Vitus' dance, for three years under old school treatment. Treated unsuccessfully at this dispensary for four months, when left arm became partially paralysed. *Plumb-acet.* 1. with almost immediate relief; in three weeks was better than for three years, slight returns of the disease being readily relieved by same remedy, and remained well, according to last report, nine months after.

21. *Josephine H.*, æt. 22. Profuse menstruation, lasting nine or ten days. *Sabina* 3. In three months, menstruation lasted only two or three days instead of eight or nine.

22. *Alice S.*, æt. 13. Chronic eczema, or salt rheum of ears and face for eight years. *Merc-corrosiv.* 3. Almost well in seven weeks.

23. *Marcus S.*, brother of above, æt. 3. Same disease for one month; almost well in three weeks, under same treatment.

24. *Mary M.*, æt. 7. Eight or ten pustules upon the eye; severe acute eczema or salt rheum of ears and nose; one pustule opened into anterior chamber of eye, with effusion of blood and matter into eye. *Ars* 1, *Bellad.* 1, *Baryta-mur.* 1, *Tart-emet.* 1. In two months was much improved. In three months all active disease had subsided, but eyes were very dim from specks and scars. In five months there was only very slight dimness left. In six months eye perfectly clean and well, without any external application whatever.

Dr. CURTIS. 25. *Barney McE.*, æt. 13. Catarrh of chest of two years' duration; cough from exercise, cold air, talking, laughing; morning paroxysms of cough which sometimes last an hour, but little expectoration. *Phos.* 3. In two weeks cough all gone, but some difficulty of breathing remaining.

26. *Elizabeth W.*, æt. 32. Indolent varicose ulcers of both legs, much improved by *Lycopod* 3.

Dr. PETERS. 27. *Mary A.*, æt. 43. Frequent and profuse menstruation, never goes over three weeks, often only two, and lasts at least eight days, profusely. *Sabina* 3. Next period menses not so profuse and two days' shorter continuance. Three months after, reported that menstruation lessened each period, and lasted only four days, and not so profusely.

28. *Helena K.*, æt. 24. Menses suppressed for five months, with frequent diarrhœa.

Puls. 3, Verat 3. During next week had no diarrhœa; menses returned; afterwards had returns of diarrhœa but remained regular.

29. *John H.* Constipation. *Nux 3.* Next week reported that bowels had been moved twice a day, which was quite unusual; week after, that bowels were much more regular than they had been for some time. Afterwards had bleeding piles. *Aloes 3,* in two weeks piles almost gone.

30. *Eliza K.,* æt. 68. Costive for thirty years, and pain in side for six months. *Nux* and *Bryon* without benefit; *Plumb-acet. 3.* A month after, reported that she had been better for a long time; pain in the side better; bowels more regular than for several years. Repeat *Plumb-acet.* In another month reported costiveness as still much better. An attack of drowsiness and return of costiveness relieved by *Op. 3.*

31. *Eliza M.,* æt. 40. Chronic costiveness; goes three and four days. *Plumb-acet.* Next week much better and remained so for three weeks more.

32. *Ann G.,* æt. 24. Diarrhœa for a month; latterly, dysentery with straining every ten or fifteen minutes, passing blood and slime. *Mercorr. 2, Arsen. 2.* Next visit reported dysentery gone, but slight diarrhœa remaining.

33. *Susan K.,* æt. 43. Liver complaint and jaundice for nine months; headache, sleeplessness, nausea, white stools, urine thick and dark like beef's gall. *Cuprum-acet. 1.* In two weeks reported her passages as bilious, yellow and brown, for first time in nine months. In a month well.

34. *Jane J.,* æt. 20. Obstinate constipation, often goes a week without relief. *Plumb-acet. 1,* without benefit. *Nux. 3.* Next visit reported bowels regular, rather loose.

DR. BARTLETT. 35. *Michael F.,* æt. 50. Partial blindness for three years, dyspeptic, acid stomach, constipation. *Sulph. 3, Hepar-sulph. 1.* In two months reported that constipation and acidity had been and were still relieved. *Bellad.* every third morning. In a month more, reported that dyspepsia was relieved, and eyes also.

36. *Laura W.,* æt. 14. Enlargement and palpitation of heart; was thirteen weeks under treatment, improving all the time under *Spigelia 1* and *Bry. 3.*

37. *Isabella McC.,* æt. 35. Dyspepsia, with nausea and constipation. *Sulph.* and *Nux.* Cured in three weeks.

38. *Mary McJ.,* æt. 50. Sick seven weeks; frequent desire to pass water, scanty discharge of urine, pain in back, acrid urine, smarting badly, mouth dry, thirst. *Canth. 3, Nux 3.* In a week was so greatly improved as to be almost well.

39. *Margaret W.,* æt. 41. Neuralgia from carious teeth. *Mezereum* and *Spigelia,* with much relief.

40. *Ann L. S.,* sick a year; distress after eating, vomiting of food, pain in stomach and

bowels, frequent cold chills and paleness, followed by flushes of heat and great redness of face. In two weeks vomiting was cured, and pain in stomach relieved.

DR. FULIGN. 41. *Mary S.,* æt. 30. Pain in back and head, vomiting and constipation. *Nux.* and *Ipec.* In two weeks much improved and bowels quite regular.

42. *Jane K.,* æt. 50. Change of life, headache, chills, flushes of heat, &c. *Puls. 3.* Remained much better for three weeks. Slight returns, relieved by same remedy.

43. *Hannah B.,* æt. 28. Scrofulous swellings and ulcers for several years, suppressed menstruation. Under *Ferr., Calc., Silic.,* and *Iod.* Was almost well in six months.

44. *Hugh G.,* æt. 5. Dropsy of the belly after an attack of measles. *Ars.* Almost well in fourteen days.

DR. ALLEN. 45. *Mary D.* Dyspepsia from childhood, costiveness, &c. Under *Nux* and *Sulph.* Bowels became regular.

46. *Mary D.,* æt. 25. Fever and ague from February to August 5th, before she came under homœopathic treatment. *Nux* and *Ars.* Improved the first week, was cured in the second week.

47. *William B.,* æt. 64. Pain in the right side for two years, difficult breathing, cough, with thick white expectoration and obstinate constipation. *Nux 6, Sulph. 4,* and *Plumb-acet.* Almost well in nine weeks.

48. *Thomas B.* Chronic discharge from ear. *Puls. 6, Merc. 6, Calc., Sulph., Silex* and *Hepar.* Almost well in four weeks.

MR. REISIG. 49. *John M.,* æt. 14. Scrofulous ulcers and enlarged glands of neck. *Calc-c.* Almost well in three weeks.

50. *Alfred S.,* æt. 3½. Rickets. *Calc-c.* Almost cured in ten months.

51. *John M.,* æt. 8. Angular projection of spine; much relieved by *Calc., China Hepar., Rhus,* and *Asafœtida,* in three months.

52. *Sarah R.,* æt. 56. Dyspepsia, pain, vomiting and constipation. *Nux.* Almost well in four months.

53. *Ellen S.,* æt. 2. Dysentery for four days. *Merc-solub. 2.* Well in less than a week.

The cases from the records of the New-York Homœopathic Dispensary reported above, are taken from a report of that Institution dated April 9th 1852, and ordered by the Trustees to be published. We shall make further extracts at a future time.

We understand that it is the intention of the Trustees of the New-York Homœopathic Dispensary, to establish a Homœopathic Hospital, in this city. If such an Institution could be organised in our city and regular clinical lectures delivered in it, it would command a large number of students of Homœopathy.

A MEDICAL CONSULTATION.

Whatever may be said to the contrary, almost every one in his own opinion is a sort of a doctor. The people will and do judge physicians. They judge of modes of practice, and they judge also of what ought to be done in individual cases of sickness. "My daughter is very ill," said a fond mother, in a soliloquy, "and I am sure the Doctor is not doing enough for her, and unless he does more, I will dismiss him and get another. Only think of it, here Susan has been sick for five days of what the Doctor says is *Typhus Fever*, and I declare at this moment she is worse than she was two days ago, and seems to grow more and more stupid every hour, and a dose of medicine given to her only once in six hours. I can't stand it any longer, and I won't. The Doctor shall know my mind at his very next visit, and unless he changes his treatment of Susan, I will dismiss him." This is repeated to the whole family, and to the friends and neighbors who may chance to drop in; and then a general consultation is held and the Doctor is handled rather severely. One says "he's a fool," another "that he never had much of a reputation." Another, "she would not have him to prescribe for her dog." Another "heard her physician say he did not know much." Another urges, "send for my physician, he'll do something for Susan, I tell you. He says a disease should be cut short at once by powerful medicine, or it may gain such headway that it cannot be arrested. I advise you to send for him immediately, for not a moment is to be lost. I would not wait to formally dismiss your doctor, for my doctor, I know, is not friendly to him, and would not stand on ceremony, especially in such an urgent case." Just at this moment the Doctor enters, and at once perceives there is trouble brewing. Not a smile greets him, although he may have been in the family as medical adviser for years. Seeing that something is going wrong, among the relatives and friends of the sick, he sets to work to find out what it is. But before he utters a word, the feelings of the mother cannot be suppressed, and she says tartly: "Doctor, Susan is worse, much worse. Nothing you have given her has done her any good, and unless *something* is done, she cannot stand it much longer. The medicine you have given might have been just so much water, for it produces no effect whatever." "My dear madam,"

says the Doctor, "you don't know that; in fact you are quite mistaken. You should bear in mind that we have here a disease which is slow in its progress in comparison with many other diseases, and affects the entire system so profoundly that if violent means were employed, they would be injurious." "But, Doctor, we have been talking the matter over among ourselves, and we have come to the conclusion that, unless something is done to cut this fever short, Susan cannot live, and had you not come in at the time you did, I should have sent for Mrs. —'s doctor, who she says would put an end to the fever at once." "I see how it is, ladies," says the Doctor, "you have made up your minds to take the case into your own hands, but I must say, you have assumed a rather fearful responsibility." "Oh dear no!" they cry, "we do not take any responsibility." "To be plain with you," says one, not at all related to the family, "we think, Doctor, you do not understand Susan's disease; we don't think it *Typhus Fever* at all; why my Bob had that disease, and he was crazy, which is not the case with Susan, and my doctor said they were always crazy in *Typhus Fever*, and if he were here now, he would not say that it was that kind of fever; I don't believe she has fever at all, for her skin is cool. I think she has got a disease in the head, and if she was my daughter, I would have her doctored for that, but Mrs. — may do as she likes. Susan is her child, and I do not like to interfere in other people's business; but under these circumstances I cannot refrain from expressing my opinion, and my doctor has often said that I am almost as good a physician as himself, and every one knows he is the very best in the city." "Ladies, I do not like to say that you do not understand what you have been in consultation about, but nevertheless it is even so." "There now," said one who had not yet spoken, "there now, that's just like you doctors, you think we women know nothing about diseases and their cure. That is just like my doctor, who is a gruff old fellow, who will never listen to my advice when any one of my family is sick, because he says I know nothing about it. And I would never have him again, were it not for my silly husband, who thinks he is a good physician, but I don't; for I never knew him to approve of any medicine I ever gave to the children, just as if he knew everything and I nothing, although I am the

mother of five children, and each of them has been sick several times; therefore I ought to know something of sickness and how to cure it." The Doctor finding that his judges had decided the case, like a wise man quietly gives the necessary directions for his patient and retires, presuming that his last visit is made, and his responsibility in the case is at an end. A representation of the case is now made to the husband and father, who says, "Wife, do as you think best. If you desire it, I will send Doctor—a note dismissing him, and then send for Mrs.—doctor." This is agreed upon, and without delay accomplished. Thus a change in the medical attendant is effected, but in all likelihood the sick girl is now in the hands of an ignoramus. He approves of all the ladies say about the case, and he even permits the administration of some medicine suggested by one of them, who assures him that she has known it to cure a great many of the same disease, and it never fails, but in this case, "if it does no good, it can do no harm."

The above is a tolerably fair description of what often takes place, and much evil to the sick usually follows. Now, as it is a fact that the people will not cease to be judges of diseases and their treatment, we are of the opinion it is best to give them suitable instruction, that they may gratify their propensity in that respect with less danger to those most interested.

SERPENT CHARMERS.

(From Dr. Kitto's Pictorial Family Bible.)

IN general these serpent-charmers were and are distinct tribes of men in their several countries, professing the power they claim to be an inherent and natural function. The most famous serpent-charmers of antiquity were the Pyslli, a people of Cyrenaica; and that theirs was believed to be a natural power appears from the story told by Pliny, that they were accustomed to try the legitimacy of their new-born children by exposing them to the most cruel and venomous serpents, who dared not molest or even approach them unless they were illegitimate. He thinks their power resided in some peculiar odour in their persons, which the serpents abhorred. Lucan says the same; and the passage in which that poet speaks of them affords a complete exposition of the ancient belief concerning the charming of serpents. He chiefly describes the measures which they took to protect the Roman camp. When the encampment was marked out, they marched around it chanting their charms, the

"mystic sound" of which chased the serpents far away. But not trusting entirely to this, they kept up fires, of different kinds of wood, beyond the furthest tents, the smell of which prevented the serpents from approaching. Thus the camp was protected during the night. But if any soldier, when abroad in the daytime, happened to be bitten, the Pyslli exerted their powers to effect a cure. First they rubbed the wounded part around with saliva, to prevent, as they said, the poison from spreading while they essayed their arts to extract it.

Then sudden he begins the magic song,
And rolls the numbers hasty o'er his tongue;
Swift he runs on, nor pauses once for breath,
To stop the progress of approaching death,
He fears the cure might suffer by delay,
And life be lost but for a moment's stay.

Thus oft, though deep within the veins it lies,
By magic numbers chased, the mischief flies;
But if it hear too slow—if still it stay,
And scorn the potent charmer to obey,
With forceful lips he fastens on the wound,
Drains out and spits the venom to the ground.

Pharsala, ix. ROWE.

In this account we find the voice repeatedly mentioned, and it is to "the voice of the charmer" that the Psalmist refers. We may suppose that, as in the passage we have quoted, the charmers used a form of words a charm, or else chanted a song in some peculiar manner. So Eusebius, in mentioning that Palestine abounded in serpent-charmers in his time, says that they usually employed a verbal charm. This is still one of the processes of the Oriental serpent-charmers. Roberts says that the following is considered in India the most potent form of words against serpents: "Oh! serpent, thou who art coiled in my path, get out of my way; for around thee are the mon-goos, the porcupine, and the kite in his circles is ready to take thee." The Egyptian serpent-charmers also employ vocal sounds and a form of words to draw the venomous creatures from their retreats. Mr. Lane says: "He assumes an air of mystery, strikes the walls with a short palmstick, whistles, makes a clucking noise with his tongue, and spits upon the ground; and generally says, 'I adjure ye, by God, if ye be above, or if ye be below, that ye come forth; I adjure ye by the most Great Name, if ye be obedient, come forth; and if ye be disobedient, die! die! die!'" In these cases we may be sure that if any true effect were produced, it was by the sound of the voice, not by the form of words, which was doubtless addressed to other ears than those of serpents; and in the latter instance we may conclude the whistling and clucking to have been the most operative parts of the process.

But music is also much employed by the charmers of serpents. By means of pipes, flutes, whistles (calls), or small drums, they profess to attract them from their retreats, to subdue their ferocity, and (when the serpents are tame ones exhibited by themselves) to make them dance, and perform various motions regulated by the notes of the music. We see nothing difficult to believe in the statement

that serpents may be, as some other creatures are, influenced or attracted by music, or even the voice of man, properly regulated; or that the proper regulation of the music or the voice for the designated end may not have been discovered and rendered most effective, by men who for successive generations have given their sole attention to the subject. Indeed, it is perhaps capable of proof that music, even in common hands, has power over serpents. Sir William Jones believed so, although not on ocular evidence. Enumerating instances of the powerful effects of music upon animals, he says: "A learned native of this country (India) told me, that he had frequently seen the most venomous and malignant snakes leave their holes upon hearing notes from a flute, which, as he supposed, gave them peculiar delight."

As to their pretensions of being in their own persons insensible to the poison of serpents, we have never met with any satisfactory proof of it. Those which they exhibit, and by which they often allow themselves to be bitten, are confessedly deprived of all or most of their venomous power by the extraction of their poison-fangs. But nevertheless, we know ourselves and have read many authenticated instances of their fearless handling of very venomous serpents in their native state; and it is therefore our impression that they possess some knack in seizing and handling such serpents which prevents them from biting till their poison-fangs have been extracted. Their presence of mind and the possession of such a secret easily accounts for all the stories told on this point. But when they do happen to fail, and to receive a bite from the serpent, they die as others. They seem also to trust to the effect of their music in so diverting the attention of the serpents as to prevent them from attempting to exercise the fatal power they possess. In this also they sometimes fail. Roberts mentions an Indian serpent-charmer who came to a gentleman's house to exhibit his tame snake. He was told that there was a cobra di capello in a cage, and asked if he could charm it. "Oh, yes!" said the charmer, and the serpent was accordingly released from its cage. The man began his incantations and charms; but the reptile fastened upon his arm, and he was dead before night. This serpent "would not listen to the voice of the charmer."

We will now briefly specify the principal forms in which the serpent-charmers exercise the powers which they claim. As the houses in some parts of the East are much infested with serpents, the most profitable part of the charmer's business is to detect their retreat and draw them forth. They certainly discover where they are without ocular evidence, and make them come forth, either in the manner already described, or by the notes of a pipe. It is often said that the charmer introduces his tame serpents, and that they obey the accustomed call, and are exhibited in proof

of the triumph of the charmer's art. This may sometimes be the case; but instances are known in which there could not have been any collusion or contrivance; and, after the severest test and scrutiny, many have been obliged to rest in the conclusion that the charmers do really possess the physical means of discovering the presence of serpents without seeing them, and of attracting them from their lurking-places. This is Mr. Lane's conclusion, who also suspects that they discover the presence of serpents by the smell, and compares their attractive powers to those of the fowler, who by the fascination of his voice allures the bird into his net. In the *Missionary Magazine* for March, 1837, a missionary to India (G Gogerly) states that some incredulous persons, after the most minute and careful precautions against artifice of any kind, sent a serpent-charmer into the garden. "The man began playing with his pipe, and proceeding from one part of the garden to another for some minutes, stopped at a part of the wall much injured by age, and intimated that a serpent was within. He then played quicker, and his notes were louder, when almost immediately a large cobra di capello put forth his hooded head, and the man fearlessly ran to the spot, seized it by the throat, and drew it forth. He then showed the poison-fangs, and beat them out; afterwards it was taken to the room where his baskets were left, and deposited among the rest." From the statement of the precautions used on this occasion, for which we refer to the publication, this was a very fair trial. Does not his beating out the poison-fangs explain the Psalmist's meaning, "Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth?" This is usually done by the serpent-charmers, who then tame them, and use them in various exhibitions. These exhibitions are much the same everywhere. The most usual are thus described by Mr. Gogerly, in the paper above cited: "Taking out eight or ten different kinds they cast them on the ground. The animals immediately made off in different directions. The *sap-wullah* (charmer) then applies his pipe to his mouth, and sends forth a few of his peculiar notes, and all the serpents stop as though enchanted; they then turn towards the musician, and approaching him within two feet, raise their heads from the ground, and bending backward and forward, keep time with the tune. When he ceases playing, they drop their heads, and remain quiet on the ground." He adds, that there is another and inferior kind of serpent-charmers, who are Bengalese of the lowest caste. They do not use the pipe, but merely beat with their fingers a small drum which is held in the hand. Sometimes these men, sitting on the ground, hold the cover of a basket with one hand, and, with the other pull the tails of the serpents, and otherwise irritate them, until the animals become so infuriated that they dart forward and seize the naked arm of the *sap-wallah*, which he exposes for the purpose. They

sometimes allow their arms to be bitten in this manner till they are covered with blood.

Other serpent-charmers allow large serpents to twine around their bodies, as if merely to show their perfect tameness, and the impunity with which they are able.

"To dally with the crested worm,
To stroke his azure neck, or to receive
The lambent homage of his arrowy tongue."

Others, again, in this situation, allow themselves, when compressed in the serpent's folds, to be dreadfully wounded in many places (the poison-fangs, of course, being wanting), till when streaming with blood, tortured, swollen, and in a really dangerous condition, the coadjutor makes his appearance, and applies the pipe or whistle to his lips. The serpents listen to the music, gradually unloose their coils, and creep back to the cage from which they had been released at the commencement of the awful and cruel exhibition.

A FEW THOUGHTS ABOUT HOMŒOPATHIC PERIODICALS.

We had thought at the commencement of this our seventh volume to be for once silent on the subject of urging physicians of our school to sustain homœopathic periodicals. But we cannot, it is so important that we must speak, and plainly too. We cannot after repeated trials realise how a physician who believes in Homœopathy can rest satisfied in the absence from his table of any one periodical which advocates that system of medicine. There are probably in this country not less than three thousand in the medical profession who profess to practice Homœopathy, and most of these had their attention directed at first to this system, through the agency, perhaps, of some periodical in the hands of a layman who chanced to have a copy; and yet how few of these practitioners subscribe for a homœopathic journal? We do not believe that more than one-third of all homœopathic practitioners in this country subscribe for a periodical of our school. If our estimate is too low, raise it to one-half, and then we urge that such a state of things ought not to exist.

From hundreds of letters received during the last six years from physicians who have heretofore subscribed for this journal, we should judge that nearly all of them take the other periodicals similar to this, published in our country. Now as we have on our list the names of much less than one-third of the estimated whole number of homœopathic practitioners, we infer, perhaps not fairly, that

a very large number of these do not take a homœopathic periodical at all; this we think is not right. We will make it a little stronger, we think it unjust. An idea exists in the minds of some, that he who edits a journal, if not paid directly by subscribers, is paid indirectly by an increase of practice, the periodical acting as a kind of advertising sheet. There was a time when this was true. It was so when there were scarcely a dozen practitioners of Homœopathy in all America, but now it is not so, that is, so runs our own experience. The editor of a homœopathic journal extends the practice of every practitioner as much as, if not more than, his own. He who faithfully performs the editor's duty must be thoroughly posted up in everything that is going on in the school; he must furnish readable matter; he must be cautious in all he says, for there is a formidable enemy in the field constantly on the watch for an opportunity, to take advantage of any unguarded point, of any incomplete sentence, or of any inappropriate word. An editor in the homœopathic school is subject to ridicule and to misrepresentation under such circumstances that he cannot resist the effects of the one, or explain the other. He makes enemies, and sometimes of those who hitherto have been his friends, his bosom friends; especially so, if he puts forth his opinions honestly and plainly. He is called by hard names, and mouths are made at him, and so on. If he be a sensitive person his life is not the most pleasant. Now, it is but just, at the present period in the history of Homœopathy, that those who are willing to do what they can to spread a knowledge of that system of medicine by editing periodicals, should be aided by the subscription of their colleagues, and also by their influence in extending the circulation of homœopathic periodicals as much as possible. At least this should be so to an extent sufficient to meet all pecuniary demands for such publications.

What would be the condition of the homœopathic school in this country if all its journals were suspended? We are of the opinion that the enemies of our school would, with some show of reason, assert that if Homœopathy is not "going down," at most it is not progressing. It is a truth, that the homœopathic periodicals furnish almost the only material for logical arguments—incontrovertible arguments in favor of Homœopathy.

It is not enough to satisfy a reasoning mind, that cases of sickness here and there under his own personal observation recover under homœopathic treatment. That physician may fairly be charged with credulity, if nothing worse, who allows himself to be convinced of the truth of a system of medicine because a few cases of severe illness under his own personal observation, recover by it. There have been too many sudden conversions to Homœopathy from such insufficient evidence, not only among physicians, but also among laymen. But what evidence is sufficient to convince one of the truth of Homœopathy? The answer to this important question is, that after the proper trial it has received from numerous practitioners, if you please in every part of the civilised world, who all testify to the same facts, and to the same results, the evidence is complete, and Homœopathy is proved to be true. Now, where will this evidence be likely to appear? Where will it be posted up? The answer is, in the homœopathic periodicals, and nowhere else.

As we cannot extend our remarks, having gone much further than we intended, we conclude by saying that we have proved that it is the duty and interest of every practitioner of Homœopathy to subscribe for all our periodicals at present published in this country, the cost of which would not exceed ten dollars a year; at least we ask you to remit one dollar for the "American Journal of Homœopathy," and as the antiquity of a thing is sometimes used as an argument in its favor, we believe this journal is the oldest of the kind in this country.

To the Editor of the Homœopathic Times.

SIR,—As your periodical has a very extensive circulation amongst non-professional subscribers, the following cases will very probably interest them, and strengthen them in advocating the cause of Homœopathy. The first letter was received by me quite unexpectedly; the writer had resided in Calcutta, where he was attacked with dysentery, and ordered to return to England. He informed me that he was the subject of diarrhœa during the whole of his homeward voyage. You have a *verbatim* copy of the communication, on which I make no comment, it will tell its own "unvarnished tale." I furnish you with the name in confidence, to obviate all suspicion of an attempt to make up a case. I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

P. M. WILMOT.

Southampton, March 25, 1852.

MY DEAR SIR,—If only as a matter of gratitude to you, as well as in the hope that others may be similarly benefited, I feel bound to state to you in writing the unexpected relief, indeed I may say cure, I have derived from your treatment. I am sure when I applied to you with the short detail of my case, which I consider fortunate under the circumstances, having been given in writing, perfect stranger as you were to me, I had little hope of so speedy or so satisfactory a result. The tone of my letter will convince any one of this; so that it is not *faith* that has cured me. Amongst other lessons I hope I shall have learned never again to ridicule or to pooh-pooh a system or a science, because the theory is opposed to what is termed "natural convictions," or, in other words, because I may not be able to understand the action of a remedy, to determine that it can possibly have none, or to determine, as is constantly done, in opposition to admitted facts, that "matter" so minutely subdivided as the homœopathic system prescribes, *ceases to possess any attribute either for good or ill*. Let those who still maintain this in opposition to all facts and experience, determine satisfactorily *at what point of subdivision* the action ceases. Let me not attribute "motives," but rather refer to the *cures* which the system is constantly furnishing, and particularly to my own case. To use the words of my last medical attendant, "he had gone through the entire Pharmacopœia; if anything else occurred to him he would let me know; thought attention to diet only would likely to be of use to me." This is now nearly six months ago, and when I applied to you, I had not for that period taken any drug of any kind; so it is not *abstinence* from medicines that has cured me. I am anxious to clear the ground a little before I detail my symptoms, because the matters I have noticed are generally fallen back upon by opponents, when beaten upon other more essential points. Well, when I applied to you, I was daily increasing in debility, from the effects of a constant purging, the action of the bowels being excited at least ten or twelve times in the twenty-four hours, night and day, without intermission (not quite so frequent in the first instance or throughout), for nearly two years, an interval of a few weeks only excepted, *induced originally* by a tropical residence, seven years ago. During the first week of your treatment I experienced little or no relief. So sceptical did I continue, that every time I mixed the powders it was with the recurrence of this feeling, to which I more than once gave utterance: "I hope this man is not cheating me with sugar and water;" consoling myself with the after-thought, that if one such practitioner could be found, surely so large a body of men as the professors of the system now number could never, knowingly,

give currency to, and continue to practise, such a deception. The only alteration I made in my diet was substituting cocoa for coffee, at breakfast: so that it is not *diet* that has cured me. My avocations have been pursued as usual, and the weather has been unpropitious, constant easterly winds. Now if it is neither "faith," "*medicine*," abstinence from medicine, diet nor change of air or scene, to which I am to attribute so decided an improvement—for I must tell you my complaint ceased entirely from Tuesday last, just a fortnight from the period at which I first took your remedies—would it be too much to require of those with whom "Homœopathy" and "humbug" are terms synonymous, to give *some rational* explanation of the recovery here detailed? For obvious reasons I do not wish my name published, but you are at perfect liberty to make any use of this statement, authenticating it by referring parties to me when necessary, for I feel too much gratitude not to spare any reasonable trouble in furtherance of the cause, for the benefit of others.

I am, dear Sir, yours very truly.

To P. M. WILMOT, Esq. M. D.

OBJECTIONS TO THIS JOURNAL.

"The matter of your Journal is too popular," says one; that is, we suppose, everybody who reads it with attention can understand the meaning of what is written. Another says, "your journal should contain more matter that would be interesting to the profession." This is a puzzle to us, we do not perceive the pertinency of the complaint. A journal that advocates pure Homœopathy cannot, in matter or in manner, resemble those which advocate Allopathy; the latter are supposed to be *scientific*, and we are often amazed that some homœopathsists who ought to know better allow themselves to be led astray by that word, the meaning of which is not always recognised. He who understands a subject thoroughly, and writes about it, if he be truly scientific, will employ the plainest language, and never "darken counsel with words," which is the case in most instances of periodicals devoted exclusively to the profession.

The doctrines of our holy religion are revealed in the simplest, and, of course, in the most beautiful language, so that the meaning may be comprehended by the common mind who reads attentively; and most of the controversies in religion arise from the so-called *scientific* discussions, the gist of which is a battle of words.

If a truth is expressed in the plainest words, it is to our mind the most *scientific* form of

doing it; for the most learned men never forget the example of our Saviour, and use the most simple words, that thereby they may reach as many minds as possible; in all humility, therefore, we say, that we look upon ourself as engaged in a great work, the vast importance of which we desire to feel, and although we deeply deplore the many imperfections of our labor as a journalist, yet we have no fellowship with that kind of *fine writing* which obscures the sense.

We do not see any force in the objections above stated, for if there be any valuable truth in medicine which cannot be expressed in plain words, we do not know it. If there be a truth in medicine which cannot be thus expressed, then it is not comprehended, and of course to the profession and to everybody else it amounts to nothing.

We said, above we are engaged in a great work. What is it? It is to make known to the people the pernicious tendency of allopathic practice by an appeal to their experience and judgment; also to convince them that the homœopathic practice is not only safe but actually approximates certainty. In doing this, the tendency is not to make every one his own doctor, but it will tend to make them "avoid that which is evil, and cleave unto that which is good."

A reform in the art of healing never took place until Hahnemann promulgated Homœopathy. Previously to that period the profession was divided into sects and parties, but they all had the same basis for their doctrine and practice; but Hahnemann discovered a new and true basis for the art of healing, and when he put it forth, a real reform in medicine was begun, and it has progressed so rapidly that the whole profession, homœopathsists and allopathists, are amazed. Why is it a real reform? First, because the doctrine is true; second, because an appeal is made to the people; of whom it may be said truly they are never wrong, especially in this country. An individual may embrace error, and cling to it all his days, but not so the people in mass; if they get wrong, they will not remain so; there is a sort of inherent self-correcting power among the people, which gives out that tremendous thing which all fear, and all seek, at the same time—*public opinion*. Now, it is our duty as a journalist to endeavor to secure public opinion in favor of Homœopathy; to do which we address the

public in the plainest possible manner, and with a zeal awakened in us by a full conviction that we advocate a true healing art. And we claim that it is right and expedient that our colleagues should aid us, not only by writing for our columns, but also by circulating our journal among the people.

(For the American Journal of Homœopathy.)

NEW-YORK, March 17th, 1851.

DEAR SIR,—It appears that some of those, professional and nonprofessional, who contribute to the pages of our periodical homœopathic literature, indulge, occasionally, their propensity of giving unprovoked insult to a *particular* denomination of Christians. A correspondent in the No. of your Journal for March, wishes to know if he is to be “subjected to a tyranny worthy only of the *Pope and his priests*?”

I suppose, sir, that Catholics, even the “Pope and his priests,” are included equally with all others, in the philanthropic embrace of our beneficent system; and that the conversion of that numerous people to our doctrines is one among the objects of our professional zeal. If this is so, then, I respectfully submit that a homœopathic journal is not the proper place for the above or any such language.

Homœopathy can sufficiently commend, and triumphantly sustain itself, on its own merits and by arguments furnished by the errors and blundering of Allopathy without betaking itself to the meaningless cant of religious bigotry. The employment, therefore, of this cant is wholly uncalled for and not a little imprudent.

By publishing this communication in your next No. you will oblige the writer and do an act which he thinks due to

JUSTICE.

The matter complained of was taken from a London paper, the Homœopathic Times. We do not perceive the necessity for the sensitiveness of “Justice,” for the words of which he complains have, whether just or otherwise it is not our province to decide, been often used, as far as our recollection runs, by writers as well as by persons in common conversation, and no disrespect intended to any one. The words were viewed by us as extravagant, but harmless, when we selected the article for the columns of this Journal.

EDITOR.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. R. P., of Washington City.—The subject of your friend's letter, as you may have noticed, is anticipated by articles selected from an English Journal.

Dr. T. M.—The “Homœopathist” has not reached this office since last December. We cannot therefore, say anything of what you speak of, as we have not seen it.

J. W. W.—We have so little confidence in published cases, that perhaps we may be over-cautious, and should publish more of them in this Journal. Your suggestions shall be heeded.

R. D.—We thank you for the personal regard you manifest for us; but we assure you that we are not wounded by the article in the “American Magazine.” We must decline your kind article. We can, or we think we can, defend ourself, but at present we see no occasion.

J. S.—After a careful perusal of your article, we see no reason why we should change our opinion already expressed against water, as the sole remedial agent. We may be accused of deficient information of the pure water treatment; but we rely mainly, however, upon the opinion and practice of certain intelligent physicians who use drugs in connection with water, in water-cure establishments. We are inclined to favor water-cure hospitals if under the control of qualified physicians, of course we mean of the Homœopathic school.

HOMŒOPATHY.

The Scotch and English allopathic physicians have been outdone by two New York physicians. The former only refused the diploma to candidates who lean towards Homœopathy; but the latter refused to walk in a funeral procession of one of their own patients if a homœopath was permitted to walk in it.

Allopathic physicians in this city, a few honorable exceptions, seem quite out of humor at the progress of Homœopathy. They no longer cry, “Homœopathy is going down,” but show by their conduct that a reverse state of things actually exists. If it were not that so many Homœopathists in this city are “wise above what is written,” and too often leave the fixed principles of our art, and employ allopathic measures to the injury of the sick and to the discredit of Homœopathy (for the people do not know enough yet to avoid *mongrels* as they would poison); were it not, we say, for these things, Homœopathy would triumph in this city in a very few years.

It is not always prudent to speak of family affairs to "outsiders," but they will somehow or other leak out, and it is reported "that the homœopathists themselves are not exactly *brethren*." This is not "exactly" so. Some of them, it is true, are "wise above what is written;" and some of them are a little heathenish, "being a law unto themselves;" and through pride and ignorance (the latter always exists in the presence of the former), they practically reject the *law of cure*, and thereby disturb the quiet of the family. But the family has increased so fast, that many of the children, when quite too young, were left to their own unrestrained impulses, and associated with older ones of the allopathic family, and got into some very bad habits, such as an indulgence in selfishness, jealousy, envy, and even in *fibbing*. But we are happy to be able to announce that the pride of that ancient and once highly respectable family of the allopathists has been moved, and measures have been taken to prevent all intercourse in future with its formidable rival—the homœopathic family. The members of the latter now perceive the necessity of keeping at home and minding their own business, and each now knows that his usefulness and his success depend upon his acting in all things in strict accordance with the rules laid down by the father of the family—Hahnemann.

There is a sort of unnatural, unwise, loosened liberality advocated by certain persons in the Homœopathic school, for which, we wish it understood, we have no fellowship; but, on the contrary, we are strongly opposed to it. This liberality, in its unnatural love, pretends to embrace Homœopathy, Water-cure and eclecticism or allopathy.

We do like to agree with our opponents whenever we can, and it turns out that we do agree with them in denouncing those hypocrites who claim to teach as homœopathists, but who employ allopathic measures in the treatment of the sick; let it be understood that we admit that every physician has the right to treat diseases as his judgment and conscience dictate, but he has no right to publicly proclaim his full conviction of the truth of one mode of practice and practically adopt another. Now, as allopathy has no fixed principles, any kind of treatment may be adopted under it, consistently; but not so with Homœopathy. She has fixed principles, which cannot be departed from, without destroying her; and although she makes no pretensions to a power which would enable people to live for ever, nor to work miracles, nor to do any absurd thing in the cure of the sick, yet she does pretend to be more safe and certain, when she has a fair field, than her opponent allopathy; and from her nature, she cannot fraternise with anything but

herself. The people should be cautious whom they employ as Homœopathists. Not every one who says, "I am a Homœopathist," is one.

The Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy.

Edited by WILLIAM A. GARDINER, M. D.,
Professor of Anatomy in the Homœopathic
Medical College of Philadelphia.

THE first number of this periodical has just reached us. It contains 48 pages, and is to be issued monthly, at three dollars a year in advance. We welcome this periodical into the homœopathic school, and from the well-known abilities of the editor, and from those also of some dozen contributors or a kind of sub-editors, we anticipate an able advocate of *pure* Homœopathy by the Philadelphia Journal.

Michigan Journal of Homœopathy. Edited
by Drs. Ellis, Hewitt and Thayer.

THE publication of this Journal has been resumed, and it is ably conducted.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., April 20th, 1852.

DEAR SIR:—The American Institute of Homœopathy will hold its 9th Annual Meeting, in Baltimore, on Wednesday, May the 19th, at 10 o'clock A. M., at the Masonic Hall, St. Paul's Street.

Candidates for Membership are requested to meet the Committee on Elections, consisting of F. R. McMANUS, M. D., Baltimore; M. DODG, M. D., Portland; RICHARD GARDNER, M. D., Phila.; D. OSGOOD, M. D., Boston; B. F. BOWERS, M. D., N. Y. City, at 9 o'clock A. M., at the same place.

The following is one of the By-Laws of the Institute:—

"Any person who shall have pursued a regular course of medical studies, according to the requirements of the existing medical institutions of our country, and who shall have obtained a certificate of three members of the Institute as to his good moral character and general standing, addressed to the Committee on Elections, and by them found properly qualified in the theory and practice of Homœopathy, and so reported to the Institute, may be elected a member thereof."

A preliminary and social meeting will be held on Tuesday evening, May 18th, by invitation of our friend Dr. McManus, at his house, No. 27 Sharp St. The Annual Address will be delivered by S. R. KIRBY, M. D., of New York, on Wednesday evening.

At the last meeting it was "Resolved, that the Institute considers it the duty of every member to make some written communication at every annual meeting, upon some matter pertaining to the general interest of Homœopathy."

G. W. SWAZEY, M. D.,

General Secretary.

P. S. For the convenience of our friends, who may be strangers in the city, it is suggested that among the Hotels in the vicinity of the place of our Convention, are the City Hotel, and the Fountain Inn.

It is to be hoped that there will be a very large attendance of members, as the meeting will be one of great importance. Baltimore is only 40 miles from Washington city;—passengers are conveyed from one city to the other in an hour and a half; and, Congress being in Session, will be an additional inducement to members, north, south, east and west to attend this next meeting of the Institute. The time of meeting, too, will be propitious, May generally being one of the most healthy months in the year.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, JUNE, 1852.

NO. 2.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE THREE CURRENT METHODS OF TREAT- MENT.

By S. HAHNEMANN.

(Continued from page 5.)

But whence proceed the great number of children's diseases, that carry off one-half of all that are born, before their fifth year? One replies, "I consider the process of dentition as almost the sole cause of the diseases and the mortality of children. We shall find, if we view the matter aright, that from the very first week of their existence they begin to suffer from this troublesome teething, and thus it goes on for several years. The poor creatures are always engaged in this teething process, some one tooth or other is always attempting to come through. Hence we refer all their whining, their capricious tempers, their working with the fingers in the mouth, their pallor, their bowel-complaints, their enlarged abdomens, their starting in their sleep, their restlessness, their turning and twisting, their convulsions, all their febrile symptoms, in short, everything that can happen to them, if we are unable to cure it, not to our ignorance, by no means!—but to one sole cause, that is as inevitable as the Turkish fate. The parents have nothing to blame us for. For if the dear child gets some well-known disease, hooping-cough, measles, small-pox, &c., and dies of it, we always have the capital excuse, that the process of dentition had something to do with it. We have the same excuse when secondary diseases occur after these maladies, as marasmus, cough, diarrhœa, ophthalmia, deafness, ulcers of this or the other part. For all these tedious convalescences no one is ever to blame, the troublesome dentition is alone in fault. God bless that man who invented this difficult teething! For, thank heaven! it always gives us something to do with children! Only it is shocking that the stupid peasant children get their rows of white teeth with no bad symptoms, quite unawares, as it were, without any aid from us, or, indeed, any medical assistance. For it might so happen that the families that employ us might fall upon the horrible idea, that kind nature knows

how to bring through the teeth without the aid of man, and can actually place them quite silently in the mouth, like rows of pearls, if the awkward officiousness of medical men, and a town-life, that great producer of children's diseases, did not hinder her."

This opinion is flatly contradicted by a colleague, who, with the usual exaggeration, attributes the whole array of children's diseases to no other cause but worms. He carries this delusion so far as to attribute a number of epidemic fevers prevalent among children solely to worms, "because they so often pass worms when affected by them." I am very much astonished that he does not begin to seek the exciting cause of small-pox, measles, and scarlet-fever in intestinal worms only, for in them also worms are often expelled (in consequence of matters repugnant to them being present in the bowels). If he cures children's diseases by means of iron, semen, contra, jalap-powder or calomel, and worms have thereby been expelled, in that case the disease, according to his notion (*fallacia causae, non causae ut causae*) must have been produced by worms, and this even if no worms but only mucus is passed (purging with jalap and calomel always causes a discharge of mucus). That must undoubtedly have been worm-mucus, he alleges.—What peculiar kind of mucus have the lumbrici, that it can be distinguished from all other kinds of mucus? And the seeds of the Persian artemesia, jalap, iron, and calomel, can they cure no other diseases besides those that arise from worms? With regard to the first, experience has shown me that it can, and as for the others the whole medical world is convinced that they can.

And are you sure that your worm-symptoms, a distended abdomen, bulimy alternating with anorexia, itching of the nose, blue rings surrounding the eyes, dilated pupils, &c., and even the discharge of lumbrici, are incontestible symptoms of vermicular disease? May they not rather be symptoms of a state of ill-health co-existing along with an accumulation of lumbrici, which may be the cause and not the effect of the collection of worms? Does not this ill-health persist even after the expulsion of many worms, does not this cachexy often last till death, and yet sometimes no worms may be discovered on dissection?

Should the intestines sometimes be found to be perforated, and should we assume that these creatures have themselves effected the perforation (and not rather have merely crept through it), it seems to be so foreign to their nature thus to bore through their place of abode, that we often find them quietly remaining in the intestines of robust children up to the period of manhood, frequently in considerable numbers, without causing any inconvenience, and apparently doing nothing so unnatural as perforating the bowels unless they are excessively irritated by some totally different disease of the child (which ought to have been removed in time by other remedies).

"Away with such gross exciting-causes of diseases!" exclaims the solidest in the narrow sense of the term, "such doctrines are not suited to our metaphysical age! Nervous debility is alone the cause of most of the diseases of our degenerated race now-a-days. Nervous debility and relaxed tone of the fibre, nothing else. All the diseases of our time may be referred to this!"—And the remedies for this nervous debility, that excludes all other causes! Tell us, my friend, what are they!—"What else except those incomparable remedies, cinchona bark, steel, and the bitter extracts?"—And how so?—"Why, look you, that everything that is bitter, as Cullen has justly remarked, acts as a tonic; whatever corrugates the tongue, like the salts of iron, must strengthen the fibre, and what can resist bark, with which we can tan hides? Now we have almost nothing else to do in diseases than to remove the nervous debility and to raise the tone of the fibre, consequently these medicines fulfil all our ends."—This would be all very fine if it were all true. If only the innumerable varieties of diseases did not produce innumerable varieties in the functions and states of the *solidum vivum*, which short-sightedness alone could dream of comprehending in a single word! If you only knew the infinite varieties of the effects of the various bitter substances! If cinchona bark only ceased to be a powerful remedy when all its tanning properties were extracted from it by means of lime-water! If you could but attribute all the various effects of iron to its astringent property!

"Even these causes of diseases," I hear some one say, "are not subtle enough for our superfine decennium, but as regards the mode of treatment, that smells strongly of crude notions. Far more subtle is the nature of diseases, far more subtle let their mode of treatment be! Nothing less forms the basis of both than substrata of the various gases. The new system of chemistry alone opens the portals of life."

"Know, that all the derangements that occur in our functions arise from a deficiency or excess of oxygen, of caloric, of hydrogen, of azote, or of phosphorus, consequently that they can only be cured by superoxydating or disoxydating, by supercalorifying or decalorifying, by superhydrogenizing or dehydrogenizing, by superazotizing and disazotizing, by super-

phosphorizing or dephosphorizing remedies."

This sounds very finely in theory and reads well on paper; it is also in the spirit of the prevailing ideas. But for every case of disease I should require the supernatural existence of a seer, to make for me all these generalities concrete, in every case to reveal to me whether the disease depends on deficiency or excess of azote, oxygen, &c., and what the chemical antidotes of this particular chemical state are, for these subjects may indeed be speculatively excogitated with some semblance of probability, but being mere products of reason are not cognizable by the senses in individual cases. *Every assertion that has some truth at bottom* (all medical systems contain a portion of truth) *is not of practical utility.*

"We must go still higher," insists a celebrated teacher of dynamology, who has been reared on the ethereal milk of critical philosophy, "we must mount up to the original source of diseases, *the altered composition and form of matter.*" This ontological maxim, however near to the truth it may appear *à priori* to the thinker conversant with natural science in general, and with the probable arrangement of our organism, is entirely useless to the practitioner; it cannot be applied to the treatment of individual diseases. In like manner what Bruce says about the remotest source of the Nile is of no practical utility at its Delta. Still, this teacher of natural science has approximated much more closely than we might have expected to what pure experience teaches, in his special views relative to diseases, and particularly fevers, and given much less scope to mere probabilities than his dogmatical and credulous predecessors. Though a love of system guides all his steps, he always honestly points out where his deductions run counter to the maxims of experience, and has a wise respect for the latter. The medical thinker may educate himself under him, but when he is at the sick-bed, let him not forget that these views are mere individual ideas, mere hints, and that from them no remedial means can be deduced.

The view of the medical art that Wilmans presents to the reflecting physician seems to be that most consistent with nature of all others, but if we would not wander from the right way, we must confine ourselves to his preliminary observations.

The schools have already adopted his classifications. All speculations in medicine, that proceed from pure empiricism, lead to particulars and not to the philosopher's stone, if I may be allowed to borrow a metaphor from a false art.

In dialectic sophistries, in bold assertions (in shameless self-praise), and in disregard of the infinite multiplicity of nature, manifested in the varieties presented by diseases and by their remedies, all known founders of medical sects, were, however, far surpassed by that deceiving

parempiric, Brown, who, though not himself engaged in the treatment of diseases, limited all possible curative considerations to exciting and diminishing excitement, and presented to the eyes of the world the greatest of all medical absurdities, "that there can only be two or three diseases, which are distinguished from each other by no other difference besides a plus and minus of excitement, and a corresponding accumulation of excitability." The therapeutics adapted to this notion were easily supplied: "seek for stimulating substances and for such as are as little stimulant* as possible; these are the true remedies." And for the first of these objects, I should imagine, one or two drugs would amply suffice. Had he wished to avoid contradictions, he should only have named one of the volatile and one of the fixed stimuli *instar omnium*, and not several; for if one can effect everything, what is the object of having several?

Perhaps, however, he felt the untenableness of his simplifications, perhaps he himself had experienced that the drunkard could not exchange his brandy for musk or camphor. In order to complete his edifice, he must have ignored even patent facts and daily experience.

But I need not enter into all the contradictions he must have felt within himself, nor what it cost him to deny the most palpable facts, in order to become the founder of a bran-new, unheard-of sect; suffice it to say, no medical sectarian, *apparently*, knew less about nature than he, but none understood better than he, by means of illusory syllogistic ratiocination, to elevate a few true (and from the novel point of view in which he placed them, apparently new) maxims into the only ones, to weave over all defects by his obscurity of stating them, and to assert so despotically the superiority of his subtle mind in secularizing all other incontrovertible truths. Probably he would himself have confessed that he had made fools of the world, had his excessive use of his diffusible stimuli allowed him to live longer.

There is no absurdity that has not already been maintained by some sophist, and in all ages the mania for simplification has been the chief stalking horse of system manufactures of the first rank.

Thus one in his theories asserted that the world was formed exclusively by fire, another that it was produced by water only;—a third contended that all living beings were formed from one egg;—thus Descartes ascribed the universe to his imaginary vertebræ; thus the Alchemists forced the infinite multiplicity of chemical substances into the triangle, salt, sulphur and

mercury. What cared they for the numerous varieties of metals? They prided themselves on dictatorially fixing the number of metals at seven, and these they falsely and boldly referred to a single original substance, their metal-seed. What else was it but proud simplifying mania, to decree our little terrestrial globe to be the end and centre of all creation, and to imagine the thirty thousand suns scattered throughout space to be scarcely more than lamps for its illumination?

Still, I feel provoked at the wiseacre who sought to measure the great science of medicine with a span, himself acquainted with hardly any other diseases than perhaps the gout,* a few rheumatisms, some catarrhs, some hæmorrhages, and the malignant croup.

From his theoretical sins, of which I must not speak in this place, I revert to those immediately concerning the treatment of diseases.

There never was a doctrine so calculated to mislead the practical physician, nor one so dangerous for the beginner.

According to him we must not trust anything to the powers of nature (xcv.), we must never rest with our remedies, we must always either stimulate or debilitate. What a calumniation of nature, what a dangerous insinuation for the ordinary half-instructed practitioner, already too officious! What a ministration to his pride to be deemed the lord and master of nature!

"We should never use one single remedy alone, but always several at once in every disease!" (xcii). This is the true sign of a spurious system of medicine. Quackery goes *always* hand in hand with complex mixtures of medicines, and he who can inculcate (not merely permit) such a system, is *toto cælo* removed from the simple ways of nature and her rule, to effect many objects by one single means. This single axiom, invented for the purpose of confusing men's minds and making a mystification of treatment, must already have cost many their lives.

He makes no distinction betwixt palliative and curative remedies. Like a bungler, he always recommends only such as are of a palliative character,† which, by an action the direct opposite of the state of the malady (LXXXIII, LXIV), at first subdues the symptoms (for a few hours), to leave afterwards a state the opposite of that produced by the temporary remedy. Thus, opium is his true panacea in all diseases arising from and attended by debility. What a climax of parempiricism and

* It is remarkable how Brown treats of gout with disproportionate prolixity, I might almost say pragmatically (§ dei, et seq.), whilst he has scarcely a couple of empty, superficial words to say about other special diseases of the greatest importance.

† I am not ignorant of the great value of palliatives. For sudden accidents that have a tendency to run a rapid course, they are not only often quite sufficient, but even possess advantages where aid must not be delayed an hour or even a minute. In such cases, and *in such alone*, are they useful.

* It surprises me that his adherents have of their own accord substituted an explanation of the latter substances, which was not that of their master, and could not be his, if he wished to be consistent. He nowhere makes mention of remedies that abstract stimulation. His sthenia-lessening substances were such as debilitated solely by the smallness of their stimulus. (*Elements of Medicine*, § xc., cclii).

what a mistake—to recommend a medicine as a general strengthener which, after the lapse of a few hours, during which it excites the strength, subsequently allows it to sink all the deeper, deeper than before its employment; to prevent which stronger and ever stronger doses must be given! And what experienced practitioner is ignorant of the effects resulting from a continued employment of opium in elevated doses. This drug that strengthens only in a palliative manner, but that is, more than any other remedy, in its after-effects weakening and productive of an increased sensitiveness to pain, Brown could recommend universally and without any limitation as the universal and appropriate remedy for all sorts of diseases, whose character is weakness, even such as are of a most obstinate and chronic character (cccī, ccxcviii). He who fails to perceive in all this the perfect picture of a parempiric has lost the use of his eyes. It is only in the special and very rare cases in which opium is at the same time the specific remedy for the disease, that it cannot debilitate, and when it is employed in very small doses as a palliative in robust constitutions and along with strengthening regimen, it *apparently* does not weaken. This is the source of the delusion. But of really curative drugs, the true weapons of the true physician,—which remove the disease *permanently and radically*, by first exciting an affection similar to the disease present,—of these he says never a word, he does not even know their names. He that knows them I term a restorer, a discoverer of the medical art, as he calls himself. Thus he had not the most distant idea—to give a single example—that a burnt finger may be held for a long time in cold water before it (when taken out and dried) shall cause no more pain—indeed, vesication occurs all the more certainly if so-called antiphlogistics, debilitating remedies be applied to this local inflammation. He has not the least idea that the opposite of all this occurs if the burnt finger be held in alcohol.* Where now are your palliative anti-sthenic, where your palliative anti-asthenic remedies? How far they are behind!

What true, experienced physician knows not the palliative debilitating power of cold and of cold water? Brown had no need to put forward as a novelty the debilitating property of cold and of the cold bath. But when he announces it to be a positively debilitating thing, he shows that he does not know it, just as he views many other things in a false manner. It is only for the moment during its application that it debilitates (palliatively), whilst in its subsequent effects it manifests itself as one of the most excellent of strength-

ening remedies (as a curative and permanently remedial means). The greatest weakness of a limb, a frost-bite, is confessedly cured by nothing more quickly than by cold water. This may stand for one of the thousands of instances of the curatively strengthening effects of cold water.

He knows no other cause of diseases besides either a too violent excitement by means of stimuli (sthenia), the continued action of which causes indirect weakness, or too little excitement by means of too weak stimuli (direct debility). The former includes all purely inflammatory diseases, and the latter all other diseases that bear the stamp of debility. The former are cured by venesections, cold, water-drinking, &c., the latter by heat, soups, wine, brandy, and particularly opium. In this manner all the countless diseases, varying infinitely in kind, are cured by him (on paper) or directed to be cured. The crudest parempiricism, the most audacious ignorance, could not go farther than this. According to this, all epilepsies,* all dropsies, all endemic diseases, all melancholias, are to be certainly cured by opium, brandy, heat and beef tea! Has anyone ever experienced a certain, radically good result from such treatment in such diseases? Is he making game of us? Does he want to consign completely to the tomb the medical art, sunk as it already is down to the administration of a few routine drugs?

But no! he is in the highest degree rational. He permits no treatment to be undertaken before ascertaining all the inimical influences that have preceded the disease, whether they could act in a too exciting or in a debilitating manner, and from these alone he will allow the nature of the disease and its treatment can be determined (but always only for two objects, viz., whether we should debilitate or strengthen). But the very circumstance of his making this investigation the only indispensable indication, betrays that he has treated disease in his study only, that he speaks as a blind man would do about colors. In all the cases of sudden disease and such as occur among the common people, who could ascertain in every instance and in the most exact manner, before commencing the treatment of any disease, what was the kind of injurious agency (as Brown affects to discover in every case) had occurred long before; whether the malady was preceded entirely or only in some degree by an excess of stimuli, or entirely or only in some degree by too weak stimuli, or in how far it was preceded by greater stimuli mingled with deficiency of stimuli (and in what proportion); whether a sthenia has changed into an indirect or direct debility, or the latter into the former, or whether one sort of asthenia has conjoined with another, and (what nonsense!)

* Look at the reaper excessively heated by working in the heat of the sun; with what does he allay his thirst most certainly and most effectually, with what can he do this better than with a little brandy? Brown's antisthenic palliatives, cold water, &c., could scarcely refresh him for an instant.

* He knows of no epilepsy with excess of good blood, no sthenic dropsy, though sthenic hæmorrhages, no asthenic cataracts, though nature knows them and not unfrequently produces them.

brought about a *mixed state*, in which the excitability of eighty degrees, that divine revelation to the inspired Brown, is exhausted or accumulated? Who can always institute a comparison between the strength of these noxious influences and the sum total of excitability assigned to the individual, modified as it is said to be by age, sex, constitution, climate, country, &c.? What experienced practitioner can assert that a tenth part of his patients or the friends of his patients could, would or should give accurate information on all these hyperbolic or hair-splitting questions, give a detail of all previous agreeable or disagreeable mental emotions, of the impressions of the various degrees of temperature to which they may have been exposed throughout a considerable lapse of time, of the exposures to too much or too little sunlight (a stimulus of no mean intensity!) or to a more or less dry, moist, impure or pure air for some considerable period, of the divers kinds of more or less nutritive, sapid, seasoned or unseasoned articles of food that may have been indulged in, the quantity of more or less strong vinous or watery drinks that may have been taken, the frequency of indulgence in venereal excitement, the degree and quantity of exercise that has been taken, the nature of the amount, the degree and the frequency of all previous mental excitement by means of reading, conversation, amusement, music, &c.? And even supposing among many families one could be found who after *some weeks* of interrogation (for it is impossible that such a variety of questions could be asked in one day) was able and willing (supposing the greater part had not been already forgotten) to answer the most of these questions, how painfully, how fruitlessly, I may say, must not the poor doctor rack his brains, in order to estimate and compare these hundreds of thousands of various influences, to calculate their exact effect on the patient whose excitability was at first so and so much, to estimate the resulting sum total, and to discover the amount in Brunonian degrees of the excess of the noxious powers of over-stimulation over those of the deficiency of excitement, of the excess of the powers of the latter over those of the former, and all this in connexion with the particular subject before him! No single circumstance of importance must remain unascertained, or be left out of the list, or be omitted in the calculation, neither must the lesser circumstances (which constitute something considerable by virtue of their number) be forgotten, unascertained, omitted or unestimated, otherwise the whole reckoning will turn out false!

I need scarcely remark how vain, how impossible, how senseless, such a mode of procedure (which, according to Brown's maxims, § XI, XII, LXXVIII, c, &c., cannot be pushed too far, seeing that all the investigation of disease depends on it) must be in every-day practice—what an enormous amount of trouble and time must be expended in the investigation

and consideration, before the treatment of a single case can be commenced; and in the time thereby lost the disease must unobservedly pass into another stage, if it do not in the interim terminate in death. A *conscientious* Brunonian would probably never arrive at the period when he would commence the treatment, with all this investigation and effort to form a just estimate. And after all, nothing more would have been ascertained but the point respecting the *sthenia* on which the disease depends, or respecting the direct or indirect debility! Is this the only thing we require to know in order to effect a cure? Well, then, know that debility is present in all endemic diseases. Now, quick! cure me all the countries affected with ringworm, pellagra, plica polonica, siccums, yaws, pian, water-colic, &c. Do you want nothing but fixed and diffusible stimuli? Here you have opium, caloric, brandy, bark, beef-tea.—Cure me them quickly!

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

The following sentiments by W. Hooker, M.D., incorporated with the report of the Committee on Medical Education, contained in the transactions of the American Medical Association, vol. 4, and virtually endorsed by the New-York State Medical Society by their republication in 1852, and sent forth to the public as the expense of the *State*, we deem worthy of investigation. We quote from the transactions of the Medical Society of the State of New-York, pages 113 and 114:

"The medical profession should be a single body of men, without any prescribed set of opinions. And the ground of admission to their ranks should have no reference to opinions; but there should be the greatest latitude in this respect. Character and education should furnish the only basis of membership."

We inquire, are these the true sentiments of the allopathic profession? Allopathy, true to herself and her interests, responds, No! What is character or education if you are not orthodox in opinions and practice? Is the man of liberal education, gigantic intellect, of exalted and sterling character, to be retained in the communion and fellowship of the self-styled "regulars," if he adopts those opinions and practices which they call heresy? The course which has been pursued by the allopathic profession answers, No! If it were so, and the man is not to be excluded for his opinions, why have Allopathic Colleges, Aca-

demies, Associations, Societies and Physicians, condemned the Homœopathic and other modes of practice, and endeavored by process of *Law* to deprive homœopathic physicians of their diplomas, defamed their characters, calling them by all manner of opprobrious epithets, poured upon them unmingled scorn and contempt, passed them by in haughty silence, refused counsel when it was desired, and treated them with derision; banded themselves together in opposition, passed resolutions excluding those of their number previously held in high esteem and in good and regular standing for opinion's sake; and by stringent rules and regulations, excluded homœopathic students from their chief seats of learning, refused to grant them the immunities and privileges bestowed upon others, for no other reason than that they dare to think and intend to act for themselves; holding opinions and practices adverse to their own. We will make another question from our author, found on page 115, and see if we can solve the question:

"Some physicians who have avowed their conversion to Homœopathy, have been excluded from the ranks of the profession simply for that reason. We find no fault with the exclusion, but only with the grounds upon which it was done. They should have been excluded, not for their opinions, but for misdemeanors. Any act by which they associate with the common herd of homœopathic practitioners is a misdemeanor, which is a proper ground of expulsion. And it is so because it casts contempt upon the necessity of those measures and provisions which secure to the community a well-educated medical profession, and not because it gives countenance to a destructive error."

Dr. Hooker, in the above quotation, admits that "some physicians have been excluded from the ranks of the profession simply for the reason that they avowed their conversion to Homœopathy," and states further, "We find no fault with their exclusion, but only with the grounds upon which it was done."

Let us inquire what are the grounds of their exclusion, if it should not be for their opinions? Dr. Hooker replies, for "misdemeanors," and defines a misdemeanor to be, "Any act by which they associate with the common herd of homœopathic practitioners."

How very liberal the allopathic profession

are! You may entertain and hold any opinions you choose in reference to the theory and practice of medicine, if you will keep those opinions to yourself; you are to be allowed the "greatest latitude in this respect," provided you have "character and education," but the moment you act in accordance with those opinions, you have turned upon the pivot by action, crossed the boundary line, and are to be excluded from the ranks of the profession. In accordance with this rule, what kind of a character would Dr. Hooker and the allopathic profession have a physician possess? Would the man be honest who acted contrary to his opinions? Webster defines opinion to be, "settled judgment or persuasion. The judgment which the mind forms of any proposition, statement, theory or event, the truth or falsehood of which is supported by a degree of evidence which renders it probable, but does not produce absolute knowledge or certainty."

Suppose a medical man has formed an opinion in accordance with this definition in reference to any theory or practice of medicine which claims to be based upon an induction from facts (except the allopathic); so far, according to Dr. Hooker, it should not be considered a misdemeanor; but the moment he applies the practical tests to ascertain the truth or falsity of his opinions, then he commits a misdemeanor, and expulsion follows. Adopt such a course and it effectually suppresses every inquiry after truth, and any advancement of knowledge in the science of medicine. And this seems to be what they require of us.

Our author next makes a false issue and asserts that which we call upon him to prove, that a misdemeanor which is a proper ground of expulsion (in accordance with the definition which he has given) "is so because it casts contempt upon the necessity of those measures and provisions which secure to the community a well-educated medical profession, and not because it gives countenance to a destructive error." In connection with this we will make a final quotation, and endeavor to ward off the allopathic venom contained in both at the same time, and (if possible!) render it harmless by appealing to the judgment of the public, which seldom errs when fully enlightened upon any subject. We quote from page 114. "Homœopaths would have the public believe that the contest between them and allopathists

(as they are pleased to style us) is between two different classes or sects of educated physicians, and simply in regard to doctrines and opinions. And it is for this purpose that they establish their societies and schools of medicine. This movement is all for mere show, and has not originated in any belief that education is needed to prepare men for the practice of Homœopathy. It is a well known fact that the great majority of homœopathic physicians are uneducated men, or at least men who are very partially educated, and the shrewd among the adherents of this system know that the uninitiated, furnished with box and pamphlet, are as well qualified to practice it as they themselves are."

Dr. Hooker must have an amount of moral turpitude or ignorance possessed by few men, to make such statements as these, even if they have been endorsed by the allopathic profession. Will the public believe them to be true? What were the majority of physicians formerly who have adopted and are now practicing Homœopathy? We answer, they were found in good and regular standing in the allopathic ranks; in as large a proportion as their brethren they were liberally and well educated men. Men of standing, with unsullied characters, holding the diplomas granted to them according to law, and many of them had enjoyed a successful practice (so far as the number of their patients, standing in society and remuneration was concerned) for periods of years varying from five to thirty. They had learned from experience the inefficacy, rottenness and falsity of the allopathic theory and practice of medicine; possessed with inquiring minds and honest purpose, searching after truth, they saw the resplendent sun of Homœopathy arise with strength and *healing* in his beams, pouring in a flood of light and truth upon their darkened minds, convincing them of error; and when convinced, although it was the accumulated error of more than two thousand years, they yielded to the dictates of reason and conscience, renounced their errors, acted in accordance with their opinions, and are now found in the full and prosperous tide of homœopathic practice, defending by actual demonstration those truths which they hold. And it is their success in practice and the judgment of the public in their favor, which call forth from allopathists and other adversaries all the animosity and hostility which

they can find words to express and ingenuity to devise.

It is true that Homœopathy "casts contempt upon the necessity of those measures and provisions which secure to the community well-educated profession."

We emphatically answer, No! Homœopathy requires of her students as thorough an education, and fully equal to that required by Allopathy; with a knowledge of Homœopathy besides. Dr. Hooker answers, our establishment of "Societies and Schools of Medicine" (which require homœopathic students to conform to the existing laws of the land in reference to a medical education; with rules and regulations requiring a thorough examination in respect to their qualifications by competent examiners, which proves the contrary of his assertions) to be "all for mere show, and has not originated in any belief that education is needed to prepare men for the practice of homœopathy." Thus charging the grossest dishonesty upon the whole body of homœopathic physicians; and would have the public believe, that "the great majority of homœopathic physicians are uneducated, or at least men who are very partially educated, and the shrewd among the adherents of this system know that the uninitiated, furnished with box and pamphlet, are as well qualified to practise it as they themselves are."

We admit and deplore the fact that there are some uneducated men practising Homœopathy; so do the Allopathists admit the same fact in their practice, and in proof, we instance the organisation of the American Medical Association, whose object is to devise means for a more thoroughly educated (Allopathic) medical profession. But, we deny the assertion that the "great majority of homœopathic physicians are uneducated men." We find the recorded names of the members of the American Institute of Homœopathy in 1851, to number 238—217 of whom have the title of M. D. placed after their names, leaving 21 with the title of Dr., two of whom, to my knowledge, have since graduated. If we examine the records of the local societies we will find about the same proportion of M.D.'s. We do not affirm that the title of M.D. placed after a man's name proves him to be an educated man. But we will inquire how was this title obtained, and by whom was it bestowed? The answer is, that the persons

possessing the title have complied with the laws of the States and Colleges that granted the Diplomas. And of those who are now practising Homœopathy, nine-tenths of them, if not more, received their diplomas from the Allopathic colleges; so that, if there is any deficiency in point of education, it is to be charged upon the Allopathic profession and its professors; for, if the persons who presented themselves for an examination were not found to be fully qualified and sufficiently schooled in the theory and practice of medicine, they have certified to that which is false.

Can Dr. Hooker prove that the "Homœopathic physicians are uneducated men?" We require something stronger than his assertion. Can he give any reason why they are not as well educated as the same number of Allopathic physicians? Perhaps he considers and urges that their adoption of the "destructive error" of Homœopathy, as he is pleased to term it, is a sufficient reason and proof positive that they are uneducated. We, on the other hand, deem it to be an evidence of superior wisdom and an advanced education. In order for him to prove the contrary he must deduce the evidence.

Is it true that "the shrewd among the adherents of this system know that the uninitiated, furnished with box and pamphlet, are as well qualified to practise as they themselves (the homœopathic physicians) are?" We answer, the "shrewd among the adherents of this system" prove the assertion to be false by placing themselves, their families and friends, under the care of homœopathic physicians when much sick, incurring an expense which, if they believed the assertion to be true, would be avoided.

There has been a great abuse made with the "box and pamphlet" which has proved to be very prejudicial to the true interests of Homœopathy, but it has arisen from a necessity which could not be met by any other means. The heads of families and others, previous to the adoption of homœopathy, were in the habit of prescribing domestic remedies in cases of slight sickness in and out of their own families. They had the various herb drinks, paregoric, Dover's powder, laudanum, morphine, calomel, salts, senna, rhubarb and an infinitude of pills, which they administered; but when the disease assumed a grave aspect, they would call in their family physician and place the patients under his care. Now they discard everything of the kind, and resort to "box and pamphlet,"

and in sections of the country destitute of educated homœopathic physicians they in many cases demonstrate even bad Homœopathy superior, and prove it to be far more efficacious, than the allopathic practice, although conducted by those who have the reputation of being scientific and successful practitioners, and "regular" in the fullest sense of the term.

The allopathists, too, have their works on "Domestic Practice." We notice that the editor of one of them, J. C. Gunn, M.D., states that 100,000 copies of his work have been sold at the South and West. Now we, with the same degree of truth (or rather falsehood), might assert that the uninitiated among the adherents of the allopathic system of practice are as well qualified, with book and medicine, to practise as the allopathic physicians are. But we do not think that the people would believe the assertion to be true, and we are fully persuaded that the public do not, and will not, believe Dr. Hooker's statement to be correct.

In conclusion we state, that Homœopathy puts forth the simple proposition, that the medicine or drug which, when administered to a person in a state of health, produces a drug disease with symptoms analogous to a disease and symptoms produced in the human system by natural causes, is the proper antidote to the last named disease and symptoms, and will certainly cure them if properly administered, provided such disease and symptoms admit of a cure. Will our opponents test the proposition.

J. C. RAYMOND, M.D.

UTICA, May 26th, 1852.

The proceedings of the American Institute of Homœopathy, for the session in Baltimore, Md., on the 19th ult., are in course of publication, and we shall be able to send them to the members in a few days.

Edward Bayard, M.D., of the city of New York, is appointed to deliver the address before the American Institute of Homœopathy, at its session in Cleveland, O., in June, 1853.

The Homœopathic Society of the State of New York, holds a semi-annual meeting at Syracuse, this day (June 1st). We do not doubt it will be one of the largest assemblages of Physicians of our school ever held in this country.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, JULY, 1852.

NO. 3.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

ON THE USE OF HIGH ATTENUATIONS IN HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE.

BY DR. C. VON BÖNNINGHAUSEN, OF MUNSTER, WESTPHALIA.

The great medicinal virtue and curative efficacy of the high and highest attenuations, or, more correctly speaking, dynamizations of conscientiously-prepared homœopathic remedies have been so thoroughly and convincingly tried and proved by some of the most experienced and honorable practitioners, that one really cannot help feeling some surprise at the strange obstinacy with which so many professed homœopathists not only refuse to employ high attenuations in their practice, but even pronounce them *à priori* as totally inefficient, and endeavor to ridicule the notion that would ascribe to them the slightest medicinal action or virtue. And yet no one who has impartially put the question to the only reliable test, that of experience, will deny that the discovery of the high dynamizations is one of the most marvelous progresses of the homœopathic science, and that no other improvement in homœopathic technics can compete with it. The immortal Hahnemann, whose talent really looks sometimes like an inspiration from above, had, in the last years of his life, arrived at a profound conviction of the efficacy of high attenuations, and had accordingly for some time followed, in the preparation of his remedies and in his doses, a method different from that which he had recommended to the public in his former works; the modifications then introduced he intended to publish to the world in the last edition of his "Organon." This edition has, unfortunately, never appeared, although I know, from several letters of Hahnemann, to a certainty, that he had completed the work, and that the MS. was ready for the printer, when death struck him. The world knows well by whose means the publication of that most important work has been prevented.

But from the same letters of the great master, with which he honored and rejoiced me during a period of more than fourteen years, and of which the last was dictated scarce two months before his death, and signed with already trembling hand, I know pretty well what he thought of high dynamizations,

and that he unreservedly approved of the notions and proceedings in this matter of myself and of my friends (Stapf and Gross). It was, therefore, by no means a mere inconsiderate desire of innovation that prompted me first to call the attention of homœopathic practitioners to this important subject, in an article which appeared in the "New Archives for Homœopathic Medicine" (vol. i., No. ii., p. 36), and to which my friend Stapf appended some remarks relative to several cases of Gross and his own, fully confirmatory of my views and experience.

I should think that homœopathists, at all events those who profess to have long used with the greatest success our remedial agents, up to the 30th attenuation, have no right to reject *à priori* the higher attenuations. Assuredly no one will venture to affirm that a material medicinal substance continues still to be present in the 30th attenuation; the homœopathic practitioner knows that no perceptible difference can be discerned between the action of the 18th and the 24th, or between that of the 24th and the 30th attenuation, although materially the differences are great enough in all conscience. This fact alone should suffice to prove convincingly, or at all events raise a strong presumption, that the medicinal virtue of a remedial agent, though (if we may be permitted to use the expression) *in-dwelling* in the matter, is by no means *identical with* or *inherent in* that matter, and that this mysterious principle which eludes the grasp of the chemist, must not be measured by the rule applied to ponderable substances, but in its evolution and propagation rather akin to the imponderable principles (light, heat, electricity, magnetism). I have this very year commenced a series of comparative experiments on the influence on vegetation which matters, indifferent in themselves, may acquire by being strongly rubbed or shaken together with substances exercising a certain action upon vegetation; these experiments, which I intend to continue, even now already give the most positive and conclusive results, showing that vegetable life is highly susceptible of being acted upon by high attenuations. I intend shortly to publish my experiments on this subject, and the results to which they have led. I have a sanguine hope that these results may

finally lead to the deduction of a new hitherto unknown law for animated nature, as startling as the "*similia similibus*." All experiments of this kind, intelligently and accurately conducted, are questions asked of Nature, and to which "the honest inquirer" is sure to receive an answer; they are of infinitely higher value than all the "opinions" and theoretical views in the world; which, if the truth must be confessed, are worth mostly the one as much as the other—i. e. nothing.

Mindful of the motto of our great master, "Audete sapere," every homœopathist, sincerely desirous of furthering the progress of our sublime science, ought therefore at least to condescend to subject to the test of experiment the statements and suggestions of his professional brethren, instead of rejecting them *à priori*, and for no other reason than that they do not happen to accord with what he may be pleased to call "common sense," and of combatting them with weapons such as the ultra-allopathists of former days used to wield against homœopathy, and which surely are not fair, and often even scarcely honorable or decent. We have never dreamt of exacting or demanding a blind faith in the truth and correctness of our statements and allegations; all we ask of our professional brethren is, that they will consent to put these statements and allegations to the only reliable test, that of experience; and we appeal to them, and request them, in the words of the immortal Hahnemann, to repeat our experiments, but to repeat them accurately, and exactly in the manner in which they are laid before you; and you will speedily discern with your own eyes, whether our statements rest upon the basis of truth or upon that of error.

It must, however, also be admitted, that a correct and accurate repetition of homœopathic experiments is by no means without its difficulties, and yet these difficulties must be thoroughly overcome ere the results obtained can be considered trustworthy and conclusive. The homœopathic experimenter should possess a thorough knowledge of the homœopathic science, more particularly of the *Materia Medica*, and should strictly and scrupulously adhere to the instructions of the great founder of the homœopathic doctrine. The most important point is, of course, always the selection of the proper remedy; but it is almost of equal importance to guard carefully against inconsiderate repetition of the doses of the remedy administered, or hasty substitution of other agents instead, or rapid alternation between different medicinal substances. The higher dynamizations of homœopathic remedies, require more particular caution in this respect, since experience has proved that they are slower and more continuous and lasting in their action than the lower attenuations, and that they can the least bear repetitions without appropriate intervening medicines. Accordingly, if a homœopathic practitioner is not in the position to select with exactitude the proper remedy, or does not deem himself possessed of

moral strength sufficient to let him calmly await the action of the remedy administered, though some time should elapse before that action becomes manifest, let him not expect safe and reliable results from his experiments, nor ascribe his failure to the method or agent recommended by others, but frankly and honestly attribute it to the obstacles, subjective or objective, that have opposed the success of his experiment. But every homœopathic practitioner of any experience and practice will find plenty of cases where he may satisfy every requirement to a successful trial, and to such cases he may, without the slightest prejudice to his patients or to his reputation, at first limit his experiments.

As this is the first time that I have had the honor to address myself directly to my esteemed British colleagues, I must crave permission to offer a few explanatory remarks before I proceed to the narration of my cases.

I have made it an inviolable rule, in accordance with the example and precepts of Hahnemann, to keep a register of every case. Now, as my practice happens to be very extensive, it will be readily perceived that, as I can scarcely have time to note down minutely every fact, symptom, or indication, I am therefore obliged to confine myself to those symptoms and characteristic indications which bear more immediately upon the choice of the remedy, and which can only be acquired after a lengthened and constant study of the homœopathic *Materia Medica Pura*. My pathological descriptions and delineations are therefore always rather brief, yet, I trust, sufficiently clear and pointed, and affording all the indications requisite to explain the reason why the remedy administered was selected. Now, as I do not like to make any addition from memory, which is mostly treacherous, I hope no one will blame me for confining myself to a literal reproduction of the respective cases as they are extracted from my case-books. I add volume and page, simply for the reason that any one who may choose to call my statements in question, and who may feel inclined to honour me with a personal visit, may convince himself from the original case-book of the perfect correctness of my statement. My case-books already number eighty volumes quarto, and I have therefore, for the sake of reference, made an accurate alphabetical index to them, which enables me to put my hand readily upon any case which I may happen to search for. With respect to the long and minutely detailed description of cases, which occupy several pages, I cannot help remarking that they look but too frequently like some historical romance, based on fact in the main, but vastly embellished in the accessories. But in homœopathic practice, the selection of the proper remedy from amongst a group of medicines, seemingly equally indicated against the main features of these accessories, depends, in a great measure, upon the occasions and their proper estimation; it will, therefore, readily be granted that poetic additions to them,

or reminiscences that smack but too often of the generalizing pathologies of the old school, can only tend to confuse and confound.

Having premised this much, by way of introduction, I will now proceed to give a few cases from my books, in compliance with the request of my excellent colleague and friend, Mr. Wilson, of London—a request to which I the more readily respond, as I am firmly convinced that it is from Great Britain principally that our noble science will spread and diffuse its blessings over a considerable portion of the civilized world. I am perfectly aware that the young doctrine has in Great Britain also had to pass, and will still have to pass, through many struggles and persecutions, particularly on the part of some of the Universities, which sounds rather old, considering the boasted freedom of teaching. But I entertain no doubt of its ultimate triumph there, relying as I do on the all-conquering power of truth, and on the generous ardour of Englishmen to aid and advance everything good and useful. Germany has indeed been from old the cradle of most inventions, but they have all been somehow compelled to seek beyond its boundaries—and more particularly in England—a soil in which to develop themselves, to ripen, and to spread. Therefore, my dear British colleagues, I tender you, from the distance that separates us, the hand of a brother, and address once more to you the motto of our departed teacher and master—"Audete sapere!"

CASES.

1. (Vol. 78, page 116). W. Soh. W—, farmer, aged thirty-seven years, suffered since three or four months from stitches in the left side, which grow worse when the patient moves much about, works hard, or gets excited; rest produces a beneficial influence; palpitation of the heart, particularly on awaking. In the morning, cough, with putrid, yellowish expectoration (formerly streaked black); oppressed respiration in a warm room. (*About eighteen months ago the patient got wet through in the fields, which was the original cause of his illness; subsequently, last summer, he had a fever, after which he felt tolerably well for a few months.*) Feels worse in the evening; feeling of uneasiness in the limbs in the evening. Cold makes him feel worse. Itching on the shoulder-blades and on the chest.

The patient can give no account of the allopathic preparations which he had taken previous to his applying to me.

March 10, 1851.—1, *Rhus Toxicodendron*; 2, *Bryonia*; 3, *Rhus Toxicodendron*, 200 (*i. e.* of each remedy two globules, moistened with the 200th dynamization of the centesimal scale). One dose to be taken every fifth evening.

March 30th. Amelioration in all symptoms, but without complete removal of any. 1. *Calc. carb.* 2000 (Jen.); 2 to 4 δ (*Sacch. Lact.*—

the symbol δ was the one which Hahnemann used to employ for this substance). One dose to be taken every fifth evening.

April 18th. Considerably better. 1 to 4 δ . One dose every fifth evening.

May 8th. No further improvement. Anxiety and oppression when lying down after meals. Sleeplessness in the early part of the night. 1. *Lycopodium* 2000 (Jen.); 2 to 4 δ . One dose every fifth evening.

May 30th. A few boils on the arms; in other respects quite well. 1 to 4 δ . One dose every fifth evening.

Perfectly cured.

2 (vol. 78, page 120). L. G—, housekeeper, thirty-nine years of age, spinster, resident in Munster. Has been suffering for the last fifteen months from *gastric fever* (so called by the allopathic school), accompanied by copious perspirations (termed, also, on that account, *sweating fever*). In the morning, at rising, vomiting of phlegm. All fat food disagrees with her. Obstinate constipation; is compelled to have recourse to pills to obtain alvine evacuations. Pains in the small of the back, both when walking about and when sitting or lying. Heaviness in the forehead. Perspirations in bed in the middle of the night, and early in the morning; perspiration when sitting down, after the least exercise, most copious in the back, under the armpits, and about the sexual parts. No thirst. Sensation of lassitude early in the morning. Headache after meals. Melancholy disposition. She despairs of her recovery.

Since the commencement of her illness up to the time of her applying to me, the patient has been under allopathic treatment, and has been literally drenched with all sorts of medicine, which, however, have only had the effect to make her go on from bad to worse. The prescriptions showed a most liberal use more particularly of the following preparations: *Potio Riveri, Spir. Mindereri, Rheum, Spirit Salisdulcis, Ammonium Muriat., Acidum Muriaticum, Senna, Colchicum Autumnale, Kali aceticum, and Sulphur, Valeriana, etc.*

March 12, 1851. 1. *Sepia* 2000 (Jen.); 2 to 4 δ . The powder to be dissolved in three teaspoonfuls of water; one teaspoonful to be taken every night.

March 29th. Considerably better in every respect. 1, *Sepia*, 4000 (Jen.); 2 to 4 δ . To be taken as before.

April 16th. Still some pain in the small of the back, and headache after any exertion; for the last four days, perspiration during sleep. 1, *Sulphur* 4000 (Jen.); 2 to 4 δ . To be taken as before.

May 5th. The fever which she had last year, at the beginning of her illness, returned yesterday, with thirst at night, and headache; she is, however, better to day. 1, *Sepia* 6000; 2 to 4 δ . To be taken as before.

Perfect recovery. She feels better than ever before in her life.

3 (vol. 78, page 126). B. B—, a boy, thirteen years of age, suffered since three months from an enormous swelling of the parotid gland, not accompanied, however, by severe pain. He has been hitherto under allopathic treatment, but has not derived the slightest benefit from it; has forgotten to bring the prescriptions with him.

March 15th, 1851. 1, *Sulphur* 2000; 2, *Psor.* 200; 3, *Sulphur* 2000; 4 δ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

April 5th. No change. Brought with him some of the allopathic prescriptions, showing that he had taken, among others, *Tart. stib.*, *Mercurius*, *Sulphur*, and *Camphor.* 1, *Calc.* 2000 (Jen.); 2 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

April 28th. The swelling of the gland much reduced. 1 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

May 17th. There remains hardly any swelling. 1, *Calc.* 3000; 2 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

Perfectly cured.

4 (vol. 78, page 127). B. B—, a girl, sixteen years of age, resident in Munster; affected since three years with a running from the left ear, of a fetid sanguino-purulent matter; the running is unattended with pain. Cutting pain in the forehead. Chronic inflammation of the eyes, though less severe than formerly. Diarrhœa, with protrusion of the rectum. Monthly period regular, but of too long duration; preceded by violent abdominal pains. (The mother had a protracted attack of nervous fever during her pregnancy with this child.)

The patient had been treated for some time by a homœopathic practitioner of this place, who is now deceased, but she had experienced only trifling benefit from the treatment, some slight amelioration having been effected in the diarrhœa and ophthalmia.

March 18th, 1851. 1, *Sulphur* 2000; 2 δ ; 3, *Sulphur* 2000; 4 δ . To be taken, one powder every fifth evening.

April 13th. Considerable amelioration in all the symptoms. The running from the ear diminished, though not yet altogether removed. 1, *Calc.* 2000; 2 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every fifth day.

Perfectly cured.

5th (vol. 80, page 131). T. B—, spinster, thirty-five years of age; affected since several years with pains in the spleen resembling stitches, and spreading from the spleen to the left side of the chest; the pains are more severe in the evening, and after any exertion. Swelling of the feet, in the evening. Trembling of the limbs. Perspires readily and copiously, particularly at night, and when sitting down after any exertion. Fat food disagrees with her. Costiveness.

The patient had been in the hands of several allopathic physicians, who had given a great quantity of medicine, but without achieving any

better result than making the patient go on from bad to worse. *Ferrum* and *Valerian* seemed to have been the favourite nostrums.

March 15th, 1851. 1, *Sepia* 200; 2, *Ignatia amara*, 200; 3, *Sepia* 200; 4, δ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

April 21st. Considerable improvement, though not yet perfectly restored to health. Diarrhœa after partaking of oily substances. 1, *Sep.* 2000 (Jen.); 2 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

Perfectly cured.

6 (vol. 80, page 138). H. L—, of H—, painter and glazier, twenty years of age; suffered since last summer from stitches in the right side of the chest, accompanied by traction in the limbs, and beating in the forehead, particularly over the left eye; the symptoms are worse during wet stormy weather, snow, hoarfrost, and in the evening when retiring to rest, and also when the patient takes a walk, or exerts himself in any other way. Cannot sleep before midnight, on account of a distressing cough, with spasms and difficult expectoration of saline mucus; after this expectoration, the patient feels his chest somewhat relieved. He can lie only on the left side (Phthisis tuberculosa)! Bread, soups, pancakes, pork and all fat food disagree with him. He feels very cold, and is always worse in the cold. Little thirst. His strength is completely gone; he can no longer work.

The patient had been for nine months under allopathic treatment, and had been made to cultivate an extensive acquaintance with the preparations of the Pharmacopœia. *Ammon. mur.* and *Tart. stib.* seemed to have been the principal favorites. His case had, however, grown worse and worse, until at length his physician left him to the curative virtues of copious draughts of tea of *Lichen Island.*, but with the same bad success.

March 16th, 1851. 1, *Kali carbon.* 200; 2, *Sulphur* 200; 3, *Kali carbon.* 200; 4, δ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

April 7th. Considerable improvement in all the symptoms, although not one of them has yet completely disappeared. The expectoration has lost its saline taste, and is now perfectly tasteless. In the evening, oppression of the chest, when sitting. 1, *Phosphorus* 2000; 2 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every fifth day.

April 30th. The *Phosphorus* has not made a favourable impression upon the system; the oppression of the chest in the evening is worse than before. 1, *Nux Vomica* 200; 2, *Kali carbon.* 2000; 4, δ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

After these remedies the patient recovered his health completely. This is one of the serious cases witnessed by Dr. Dunham, of New York, during his stay here.

7 (vol. 78, page 137). H. H—, a boy, eight years of age, was affected at the age of six months with a fever (pectoral fever), and has

been suffering ever since. Cough, with pain in the chest; the cough is dry in the evening, but in the morning it is accompanied by expectoration of a sweetish matter, tasting like milk, or like nuts. Strong appetite; eat as much as he may, the patient hardly ever feels satisfied. Perspiration as soon as he falls asleep. Brown urine in the morning. Great desire to drink milk. Constant rheum.

The patient had been hitherto under allopathic treatment, but without deriving any benefit from the same. The prescriptions could not be got.

March 18th, 1851. 1, *Sulphur* 200; 2, δ ; 3, *Calc. carb.* 200; 4, δ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

April 12th. Considerable improvement in all the symptoms, 4 δ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

No further remedy or treatment was required to restore the boy to perfect health, which he has continued to enjoy up to the present moment.

8 (vol. 78, page 142). B. H—, a student, twenty-four years of age, resident at Munster; has been labouring for about a year under a peculiar kind of difficulty of breathing; he feels as if there were a valve in the throat, intercepting the breath; this grows worse in the evening in bed, when the patient often feels as if he were on the point of suffocation. Cough unattended with pain; scanty expectoration, brought up with difficulty. Sensation of lassitude, in the chest. When drawing in the breath, the patient has a sensation as if his chest were too narrow. In the early part of the morning he feels better.

The patient has been under allopathic treatment. The last remedy recommended by his physician was *Lichen Island.*, but he has not derived the slightest benefit from this or from any of the other medicines administered to him.

March 19th, 1851. 1, *Spongia* 200; 2, *Hep. sulph. calc.* 200; 3, *Spongia* 200; 4, δ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

April 16th. The sensation of the presence of a valve in the throat is completely gone. The difficulty of breathing is considerably less, and confined entirely to the morning. Cough when drawing a deep breath. Headache in the morning. Sensation of cold in the stomach. 1, *Phosphorus* 2000; 2 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

May 14th. Improvement in all the symptoms. 1, *Kali carb.* 2000; 2 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

June 18th. The *Kali carb.* seemed to have been badly chosen; perhaps its administration was premature. The patient feels very cold and chilly, particularly in the morning; the sensation of a valve in the throat has come back, and is more strongly felt now in the act of exhaling. Palpitation of the heart has come on. 1, *Spongia* 2000; 2 to 4 δ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

Perfect recovery took place after these remedies.

I beg to call the particular attention of my homœopathic colleagues to the consequence of the ill-advised administration of the *Kali* in this case, as in Case 6 of that of the *Phosphorus*. The injurious consequences of these two doses clearly prove the powerful action of high dynamizations upon the system.—*Hom. Times.*

(To be continued.)

(Reported for the American Jour. of Homœopathy.)
HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY
OF THE STATE OF NEW-YORK.

SEMI-ANNUAL MEETING.

Syracuse, June 1st, 1852.

This being the day appointed for the semi-annual meeting, the society met at the rooms of the Franklin Institute, and the meeting was called to order by the President, Lyman Clary, M.D., at half past 10 o'clock A. M.

The large attendance of members, representing nearly every section of the state, presented a gratifying evidence of the interest taken by the profession in the objects of the association.

The minutes of the annual meeting were read by the Secretary, and approved.

A considerable time was then occupied in the proposition and election of new members. A motion was made, on account of the number of candidates proposed, to dispense with the rule which requires a ballot in each case, but the society decided against the adoption of such a precedent. About forty members were added to the roll of the society; a considerable proportion of whom were present and signed the constitution.

The Secretary reported, verbally, that in consequence of the paucity of information he had received, he was unable to present a satisfactory report in compliance with the Resolution passed at the annual meeting in relation to the statistics of Homœopathy in this State, and asked that he might be allowed till the next meeting to complete the report. The report was accepted and leave granted.

The committee appointed at the last meeting to prepare and circulate an address to the Homœopathic Physicians generally throughout the State reported that they had complied with the terms of the resolution, and had sent a copy of the appeal to all the Homœopathic Physicians whose address they could obtain. The report was accepted and the committee discharged.

Dr. Humphreys, from the Bureau for the

enlargement and improvement of the *Materia Medica*, presented a preliminary but very interesting report, on the necessity and importance of a more general experimentation by Physicians upon themselves, of the yet imperfectly known medicinal agents.

The following substances were specially recommended by the committee to the members of this society, for trial during the present year, viz. :

Further provings and observations with the *Apis Melifica*.

Proving of the *Hamamelis Virginiana*.

Proving of the *Plantago*, and of the *Ainifuga*.

Proving of Urea and its combinations.

Specimens of these articles may be obtained by application to either of the members of the committee.

The Report concluded with the following Resolution :—

Resolved, That each member of the Society be requested to make a proving of at least one drug upon himself during the present year, and to report such proving to the Bureau on or before the first day of January next.

A spirited discussion arose upon some points involved in the report and resolution, in which several members participated.

The Resolution was finally passed with great unanimity.

Dr. Humphreys offered the following Resolution :—

Resolved, That all members of this Society be requested to report to the annual meeting, in writing, at least one case, cured in his practice, by a single remedy. Adopted.

Dr. Metcalf moved that when the Secretary gives notice of the annual meeting, he be requested to have the two resolutions above mentioned, printed with the said notices.

Dr. Metcalf read a communication on a method of preserving vegetable juices for medicinal purposes, which was directed to be published.

Dr. Richardson exhibited a specimen of the false membrane of croup, thrown off in a case successfully treated with *Lachesis*.

Dr. Munger communicated details of cases of dropsy after scarlatina, and erysipelas, successfully treated with *Apis Melifica*.

Dr. Weeks made a verbal communication, further illustrating the favourable effect of *Apis Mel.*, in Erysipelas faciei.

Dr. Barber related a case of extensive dropsical effusion, in which the *Apis* was prescribed without apparent benefit, but which was cured by *Asparagus 1*, and *Arsenicum 30*.

Dr. Munger's paper was directed to be printed.

Dr. Humphreys offered the following resolution :—

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to consider the expediency of establishing a Homœopathic Medical College in this State, and to report at the annual meeting.

The Resolution was debated at considerable length by several members, and in a manner which exhibited their estimate of the great importance of the question, and the necessity of the adoption by the Society of a true policy in regard to the subject of medical education.

The resolution was finally carried, and Drs. Ball, Beakley, Humphreys, Childs and Chase were appointed the committee.

On motion of Dr. Paine, a committee of three, consisting of Drs. Richardson, H. D. Paine and Munger, was appointed to inquire into the expediency of effecting an incorporation of the Society under the laws of the State.

Dr. Guy offered the following resolution :—

Resolved, That the Secretary be requested to send a copy of the constitution to each member of the Society who has not already signed it, with a request that he will return it to the Secretary with his signature affixed. Carried.

On motion of Dr. Metcalf, a committee was appointed to report at the next meeting on the proper mode of proving drugs.

The Society then adjourned to meet at 8 o'clock P. M., in the Court Room of the City Hall, for the purpose of hearing an address.

8 o'clock P. M.

At the hour appointed the Society, together with a large and intelligent audience of ladies and gentlemen, assembled at the City Hall.

The meeting was called to order by the President, who expressed his pleasure in introducing to the audience J. W. Metcalf, M.D., of New York, who then proceeded to deliver his address.

On motion of Dr. Humphreys the following resolution was passed unanimously :—

Resolved, That the thanks of the Society are hereby tendered to Dr. Metcalf for his able, interesting and convincing address, and that a copy be requested for publication.

Also, *Resolved*, That two thousand copies

of the address be printed for the Society, and that the author be also requested to publish it in the next number of the North American Homœopathic Journal.

After which the Society adjourned.

(For the American Journal of Homœopathy.)

PROFESSIONAL IGNORANCE—ON WHICH SIDE IS IT?

While some of the gentlemen of the new and the old school are agitating the question of professional ignorance, it may not be amiss to furnish the combatants with the following announcement, which was made some three or four years ago in this city. It may shed a ray of light on the controversy.

"I find that small doses of Ipec. will stop the vomiting, and that small doses of Rhubarb will stop the diarrhœa; a *strange anomaly surely*."

I take these words from an article published in one of the city papers by Dr. Anderson, Allopath, on the occasion of an expected attack of Asiatic cholera, three or four years ago.

Everybody knows that it is a constant rule with Homœopathy to administer medicine in "small doses;" and most intelligent persons know, or may easily know, that the curing of certain forms of vomiting by Ipec., and of certain forms of diarrhœa by rhubarb, is an every-day work of Homœopathy, in all parts of the world, even up by the learned doctor's nose.

Guided by law—the law of nature—Homœopathy discovered the curative powers of these two drugs, and that it resided in "*small doses*;" kept groping in the byways of "scheming and conjecture," Allopathy has remained ignorant of those curative powers, and of the quantity of those drugs in which that power resides, and, therefore, never could arrive at a more enlightened practice than that which characterises those old doctors of the other set who abound in all our country villages, and who, in a very respectable degree, share with the learned gentlemen of Allopathy the confidence of the people! And what is that practice? It is to administer these drugs as the cod liver oil is administered in large doses; although, in *every instance*, the hostility of the poison to the organism is unequivocally manifested, in the case of Ipec., by vomiting, with pallors, cold sweat and a sense of suffocation; and in that of rhubarb, by sour-smelling diarrhœa, tenesmus and colic.

But Dr. Anderson has *found* out the proper use and the proper doses of these two drugs; only he calls the thing an "anomaly," nay, a "strange anomaly." Now, unless the gentleman is prepared to admit that his beloved Allopathy has always taught "strange anomalies," instead of correct rules of practice, he must grant that it never taught or even knew what *he* "found," and, consequently, that it, that he and his whole school were ignorant, up to the hour of his discovery, of two essential things respecting two of the most familiar drugs of the Materia Medica, namely, the curative effect and the dose which he states. Or he must admit that he "found" what did not exist. I leave him his choice of the two horns of this dilemma.

It is amusing to observe the readiness with which the Allopathic Doctor called his discovery an *anomaly*. An anomaly argues the pre-existence of a *rule* from which the thing called an anomaly is a deviation. To give, then, a small dose of Ipec., or a small dose of Rheum, even though the one is sure to cure vomiting and the other diarrhœa, is an anomaly, nay, it is "surely" a "strange anomaly!" Oh no! dear Allopathy. There is no anomaly either way; the sickness of the large doses and the health of the small ones are both in accordance with natural laws.

But you have manufactured for yourself a rule which plainly shows you to be but partially acquainted with those laws—the rule of giving large doses. It is this stupid rule of yours that is the anomaly, and, viewing its destructive effects by the side of your high claims, "a strange anomaly surely."

JUSTICE.

14th June, 1852.

Nelson's Northern Lancet is making personal attacks on our old friend of the Medical Gazette, of this city.

We would be cautious how we meddle with other people's business, especially a quarrel among allopathists; but as we happen to know a good deal of the Editor of the Gazette we will just whisper in the ear of the *Lancet* that he has mistaken his man if he thinks to lower his standing in the profession or diminish his influence in it by personalities.

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

First monthly report of cases treated at the Homœopathic Dispensary, corner of Broadway and Broome street, between the hours of 12 M. and 1 P.M. of each day (Sundays excepted). Commencing Monday, May 3d, 1852.

No. of Patients, ... 139

No. of Males, ... 37

No. of Females, ... 102

No. of prescriptions for the treatment of the above, 323

The following is a summary of the character of the diseases, and the result of treatment, viz:

Names of Disease.	No. of Cases.	Cured.	Improv- ing.	Not reported.	Died.
Abscess, ...	3	2	1		
“ Lumbar, pointing in the left iliac region, ...	1	operat'd	1		
“ Axilla, ...	1	1 do			
“ Neck, ...	1	1 do			
Accidents, ...	4	4			
Dislocation of wrist, ...	1	reduced			
“ elbow joint, ...	1				
Fracture of forearm, ...	1				
Asthma, ...	3	1	2		
Consumption, ...	3		3		
Constipation, constitutional, ...	2	2			
Cataract, ...	2		2		
Chronic Cough, ...	3	1	2		
Dyspepsia, ...	5	1	3	1	
Dysentery, ...	2	1	1		
Deafness, ...	1			1	
Dropsy, ...	1		1		
Debility, ...	4	2	1	1	
Eruptions, Psora, Eczema, &c., ...	10	2	5	3	
Felons, ...	2	2			
Fevers, Intermittent, ...	3	2		1	
“ Synchol, ...	1	1			
Headache, Chronic, ...	10	2	4	4	
“ Sick, ...	1	1			
Heart disease, ...	1		1		
Injuries, ...	4	3	1		
“ of Head, ...	1	1			
“ Back, ...	1	1			
“ Genitals, ...	1		1		
Inflammation of Lungs, ...	7	4	2	1	
“ Tonsils, ...	1	1			
“ Bladder, ...	1	1			
“ Eyes, ...	7	3	3	1	
“ Face (Erysipelatous), ...	1	1			
Leucorrhœa, ...	1	1			
Lumbago, ...	1	1			
Menstrual irregularities, ...	2	2			
Mercurial disease, ...	1	1			
Neuralgia, ...	3	3			
Opacity of Cornea, ...	2	1	1		
Otorrhœa (discharge from ears), ...	3	2	1		
Piles, ...	2	2			
Prolapsus Uteri, ...	2	1	1		
Pyrosis, ...	1	1			
Paralysis, ...	1	1			
Rheumatism, Chronic, ...	13	6	5	2	
Rickets, ...	1		1		
Scrofula of Glands, ...	11	4	5	2	
Scrofulite ulcers, ...	4		3	1	
Toothache, from Caries, ...	4	4			
Teething, ...	1	1			
Tumours, ...	2	1	1		
Ulcer ated mouth and throat, ...	1	1			
Ulcers, indolent, ...	2	1	1		
Urinary organs, disease of (7 years standing), ...	1	1			
Vertigo, ...	3	1	2		
Worms, ...	3	1	2		
“ Ascarius Vermicularis (Thread-worm), ...	1	1			
“ “ Lumbricoides (Round-worm), ...	1	1			
“ Tinea lata (Tape-worm), ...	1		1		

The ages of the patients ranged from nine months to seventy years, and a large majority were old chronic cases which had successfully resisted any other mode of treatment. One of the cases cured under the general term eruption, was scald head, of near sixteen years' standing. And one of the other cases cured, suggests not only an interesting but an important inquiry, particularly as regards the effectiveness of the different attenuations of Pulsatilla. It was a case of Asthma, with Otorrhœa (discharge from the left ear), of two years' standing, secondary to Measles; Puls. was distinctly indicated, and the 3d was accordingly prescribed, and taken without producing any change of symptoms; it was repeated the second and third time with similar result. Considering the drug so specifically indicated, I prescribed the 30th; the first dose produced a marked improvement, the second cured

M. FRELIGH, M.D.

New York, June 15th, 1852.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL.

On the 7th inst., at 112 Gloucester Place, Portman Square, the Hon. A. H. Macdonald Moreton in the chair, a meeting of gentlemen, interested in the extension of Homœopathy, was held to consider what steps were best calculated to advance their object.

It was resolved, to effect the purpose they had at heart, to found a hospital for the treatment of children; and it was further resolved to take immediate measures for carrying this resolution into execution.

It was resolved that the hospital be conducted upon the principles laid down and practised by Samuel Hahnemann.

That case-books be kept at the hospital, in which shall be stated the fullest history and the existing symptoms of the patient on entering the hospital, the medicines given, the subsequent symptoms, and the subsequent medicines given, which books shall be, at all reasonable times, open to all subscribers.

That the medical officers of the hospital shall give clinical instruction or lectures, and afford every facility to medical practitioners and students, to become acquainted with the homœopathic system of practice.

That the medical officers shall publish periodically a collection of cases from their hospital practice, in illustration of results, be they favorable or otherwise.

That the hospital be managed by a committee of laymen, who recognise the Organon of Hahnemann as the only sound basis by which his system of medical practice can be tested.

That the payment of five shillings annually shall constitute a subscriber, but that donations be received to any amount.

That whenever the funds of the hospital shall admit of it, some provision shall be made for attending poor women in their confinements.

It is highly important that the principles upon which the medical practice is to be conducted should be strictly defined, to guard against a routine system of spurious practice, which is unfortunately too prevalent at present, and totally at variance with Hahnemann's precepts. The principles of Hahnemann were, to take down carefully all the symptoms of the patient, to compare them with the recorded symptoms of the medicines whose effects are known, and to select the medicine that shall appear to be most homœopathic to the most minute totality of the collected symptoms (objective and subjective) of the patient, or, in other words, to find a medicine that shall be, as nearly as possible, analogous, in its ascertained and recorded effects, to the symptoms of the complaint.

All the so-called specifics in the old system of medicine (which operate curatively) are, in fact, homœopathic to the diseases against which they are given successfully. Such as *Bark* against certain forms of intermittent fever, *Opium*, against delirium tremens, *Sul-*

phur in itch, *Camphor* for strangury from blisters, etc., etc.

What we have taken the liberty of calling the spurious routine system is the selecting a medicine that shall relieve only one or two of the most prominent symptoms of the complaint, and then going on to another; giving one medicine for one symptom, another for another, without due examination. This requires far less labor, far less ability than the system propounded by the founder of Homœopathy, and it is far less happy in its results to the patient.

With regard to the teaching the system of Homœopathy to pupils; let them at least learn by the more laborious and more successful mode of practice.

It is with the view to ensure this laborious and difficult yet simple practice its full complement of study, that the case-books are to be rigorously and exactly kept, and open to inspection. The periodical publication of cases will, it is hoped, show the public that in the Child's Hospital some effort at least will be made to practise and teach homœopathy as propounded by its founder.

The sum of five shillings constituting a subscriber, it is expected that vast numbers, of limited means, will be stimulated to become contributors and participators in this noble undertaking.

It is trusted that a sufficient amount will be raised by an extended list of subscribers, and that many who know nothing about Homœopathy will give the small amount of five shillings to an establishment where everything is so open and so public; that they may be fairly assured whether there may not be truth in a system that tells the fond mother that croup need no longer sound a death knell in her ear, but that it is a curable complaint; that scarlet fever is no longer a dangerous complaint; that bronchitis and inflammation of the lungs are deprived of more than half their terrors.

At least we trust that we may calculate that each mother, who believes that her child's life has been saved by Homœopathy, will give five shillings to help to save the lives of her poorer fellow-creatures.

A list of lady patronesses and other philanthropic supporters will shortly be published. Meantime subscriptions, etc., will be received by Mr. Baillière, bookseller, 219 Regent Street, and by the following homœopathic chemists:—Mr. Headland, 15 Princes Street, Hanover Square; Mr. Leath, Vere Street, Oxford Street; Mr. Lane, Sloane Street; Mr. Storer, Foster Lane; Mr. Walker, Conduit Street.—*Hom. Times.*

HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE.

Homœopathy has principles clearly defined, from which are derived rules of practice of an exactness hitherto unknown in the art of healing. But what avails it to the sick, if these

rules are not understood by the practitioner; or if understood, disregarded in practice? We would fain never find fault. Our inclination is to allow every one to go on undisturbed in the way he thinks right; which we would do, if there was reason to believe that practitioners of medicine did use industriously, perseveringly, and to the full extent, those mental endowments with which the CREATOR has favored them. If we could see every one at work with his own mind, observing, reading, studying, and writing; if we could see every practitioner of Homœopathy carefully and minutely examining cases of disease with a thoroughness and precision allowed by the *Materia Medica Pura*, and thus select the remedies, and under the inspiration of a love of truth, and of humanity, apply them, distinguishing at all times between mere theory and well defined facts, and bringing everything that relates to disease and its treatment under the logical rules of the closest and universally admitted soundest reasoning; if, we say, we could see such evidence of a love of truth among physicians; and such an honesty of purpose, and such a freedom from mental slavery, then there would be an end of fault-finding; an end of envy and of jealousy; an end of pride and of vanity; an end of disreputable selfishness and hypocrisy among practitioners of the healing art. But such a happy, humane, honorable and dignified state of things does not exist; we lament it deeply that it does not. Therefore we must aim for it, and labor for it. For this reason, and for this object, we declare the conviction of our mind that a strict adherence to the principles of homœopathy, and her rules of practice under all circumstances, is essential to a safe and certain practice. In cases of serious sickness, even a slight omission of the rules of practice, or a slight deviation from them, may defeat a cure. No one, in the nature of the thing, can be certain of his remedy unless he carefully consult the *Materia Medica Pura*; no one, unless he disciplines his mind to minute observation and to close reasoning, can perceive and rightly use the actual phenomena always developed in the treatment of every case of sickness homœopathically. To mistake the phenomena of a disease for those of a drug, is of the most serious nature to the sick and to the practitioner, and yet there is reason for the assertion that blunders of this sort are

committed daily, to the injury of homœopathy as well as irreparable mischief to the sick. We know that deficient knowledge on the part of the people is an embarrassment to the practitioner of homœopathy. But in our humble opinion this should be met in a calm, dignified and firm manner. In allopathic practice in many, we were about to write, in almost all cases, the patient, or the relatives and friends, actually control the treatment. Attempts of this sort all of us meet with, but in a proper way we should do our duty faithfully, and insist upon a strict adherence to the rules of our art, and where this cannot be done, a love of truth and our own reputation should be a bar to any action or responsibility on our part. The people, because of allopathic teachings, will, for a long time to come, undertake to direct the medical treatment of themselves, even in the presence of the physician. This cannot be obviated suddenly, it must be endured, it being one of those perplexing things we meet with in a faithful discharge of duty.

It is, to our mind true, that upon homœopaths devolves the great work of correcting popular errors in medicine; allopathists cannot do it. They are the sole cause of those errors; they exclaim against them, we know, but in very general terms; and when they come to particulars, it amounts mainly to this, that the people see fit to employ one physician instead of another, that is, one allopathist instead of another allopathist, and if we analyse the complaint, it amounts to but little else other than dollars and cents. This, by the way, is about the gist of the opposition to homœopathy. If it were a love of truth, we should not hear of vulgar personal denunciations, which are so common in medical associations and periodicals. He who is honest, he who loves truth, he who has a high sense of honor, he who is wise, never indulges in vulgar personal denunciation for opinion's sake.

The allopathic school can never correct what is termed "popular errors in medicine," for these very errors are but a part and parcel of itself developed in unlearned language and in practice without the showy forms of the allopathic physician. He who professes to hold fixed principles in medicine is bound to rely on those principles in practice, or publicly abandon them. Honesty demands this of him. He cannot be guiltless who professes faith in homœopathy before the public, and is

thereby employed on account of such faith, and for no other reason, is morally bound to abide by his principles under all circumstances. Homœopathy, as taught by Hahnemann, has been fully tested, and is no longer a doubtful system. If his professed disciples would do as he did, fairly and openly, and not be moved to the right or to the left for fame or money, in a few years allopathy would be looked upon as a thing that was.

FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE AM. INST. OF HOMŒOPATHY.

In accordance with a former resolution of the Institute, making it the duty of each member to present a communication on some medical subject at every annual meeting, I hereby communicate the history of a recent case of the death of a lady in the city of New Haven from the use of chloroform, which was administered previous to an intended operation for the extraction of a portion of tooth.

Mrs. E. N., aged 24 years, of medium size, weight about 120 pounds, light complexion, blue eyes, brown hair, had been married about six years, and at the time of her death was the mother of two children, the youngest of which was aged about six months, and still nursing. About fourteen months before her death, one of her molar teeth in the lower jaw having become carious caused her much pain, when Dr. P.—a reputable allopathic physician—advised her to have it extracted, and at her request he administered about one ounce of chloroform, which rendered her so far insensible that the tooth, or the greater part of it, was extracted without pain. The anæsthetic effect of the drug passed rapidly off without unpleasant results, when the Doctor discovered, contrary to his anticipation, that a portion of the tooth was still remaining, from which, or some other cause, an abscess formed and made its way outward through the cheek, but finally healed. The remaining portion of tooth gave her pain occasionally, and on the 7th ult. she applied to Dr. P. again to extract it, when he administered chloroform.

The circumstances and fatal results attending its administration I now give according to the testimony of Dr. P. and two females, present at its administration, at a coroner's inquest held the day after her decease :

At about half-past three o'clock, P. M., she was seated in a chair, when the physician, having saturated a piece of sponge (about one and a half inch in diameter) and placed it in a napkin, held it near, but not in contact with the nostrils. The sponge was again moistened two or three times in a period of from five to eight minutes, and again applied as before. While inhaling the fumes she remarked repeatedly that she did not feel its effects, and asked for more, and was conversing, laughing, and swinging one of her feet until she had inhaled nearly one drachm of chloroform, when Dr. P. discovered that her respiration was suddenly affected, and on examining her pulse, found it nearly imperceptible. He immediately placed her on her back, on the floor, and after a few short respirations, she expired without a struggle or groan.

I was called in to see the patient immediately after she ceased to breathe, and found her physician inflating her lungs, while his assistants were applying water, and friction, and stimulants, for her restoration, which were continued for some time without the least apparent effect. Her countenance appeared quite natural, but her fingers were a little livid.

On the following day a coroner's inquest was held to inquire into the cause and circumstances of her death. The two female attendants, present at the administration of the chloroform, confirmed the testimony of the physician, except they thought the time consumed in its administration was not exceeding five minutes before her "eyes became set," as they termed it. One of the females testified that she was a nervous woman, and subject to palpitation of the heart, but had not been confined by severe indisposition since adult years.

It was currently reported in the community, before the examination, that a disease of the heart was probably the cause of her death, and but for the post-mortem examination, her death would doubtless have been attributed by her physician and others to a disease of the heart, instead of the true cause. At the request of myself and other physicians present at the coroner's inquest, a post-mortem examination was had about twenty hours after her decease, in the presence of eight physicians, conducted very carefully by Professor K., and the following minutes were made by myself during the examination :

Her countenance appeared quite natural ;

chest well formed ; adipose substance on the chest and abdomen, about three-fourths of an inch thick. Upon the examination of the thorax the pericordium and pleura appeared healthy, and less fluid in the former than usual. The lungs, the heart, and valves, and other appendages, appeared perfectly natural, the right side of the heart contained a small quantity of fluid blood, the left side entirely empty ; the aortas and cavas were in a healthy state, and the latter contained fluid blood. In the abdomen, the stomach, liver, intestines, and the viscera were in a healthy state. The only variation from a perfectly healthy state of the contents of the thorax and abdomen was a slight engorgement of the small superficial vessels, which, when cut, were found filled with fluid blood of rather a darker color than when in perfect health.

On opening the cranium the vessels of the dura mater appeared slightly turgid, as well as the superficial vessels of the brain or pia mater. The sinuses contained some fluid similar in character to that of other vessels, but the brain was in a perfectly healthy state. The physicians present were all allopathic, except myself, and all testified that the chloroform was administered in a manner usually considered safe by those who use it, and all but Professor K. and myself justified its use in the case under consideration. All of the physicians present testified that the death was caused by chloroform. The jury rendered a verdict in accordance with the testimony, and entirely exculpated Dr. P. from all censure. I have been thus minute that all the circumstances may be preserved for reference with other cases in determining the propriety of its administration hereafter.

The fatal termination of this case affords another melancholy illustration of the impropriety of resorting to a remedy of such power, and so dangerous to life, in a minor operation. In my opinion, the patient fell a victim to its administration in a case not demanded by the nature of the intended operation, and the only consolation we have is, that the physician, although erring in judgment, acted in good faith, and that the melancholy and sudden death will, it is hoped, restrain him and others from its common use, and when not absolutely demanded by the length and severity of the operation, and attendant circumstances that may justify a resort to so potent yet so dangerous a remedy.

The physician, though not a professional dentist, had obtained considerable practice where scientific dentists and other physicians had refused to administer anæsthetic agents. He stated that he had administered chloroform in from one to two hundred cases, in the same manner, with the same identical sponge in all of them, and in a part of the cases, chloroform from the same bottle.

This case, too, affords additional evidence with those already on record, that the use of chloroform by a person at one time with impunity affords no assurance whatever of the safety of its repetition at a future period.

One thing is most certain, we have no means of determining *à priori* in any case whether its administration will terminate fatally or not. The strong as well as the weak, of different ages, and of both sexes, have fallen victims to its administration. There are no well defined or safe rules by which we can determine in advance, either the precise effect or the quantity the patient will bear. Various rules have been published for the safety of its administration, but experience has shown them to be fallible. The danger depends, no doubt, on contingencies entirely beyond our comprehension. In the language of another, "There is no ascertained law of progression, in the activity of the anæsthetic agent, and no one can know, in the commencement of its administration, upon what part of the brain it will ultimately fall." I apprehend it will be found from an examination of all the cases of death from chloroform or ether, administered as an anæsthetic (reported in the medical journals), that a large share of them have occurred in their administration for minor or comparatively speaking trivial operations, such as extracting teeth, extirpating toe nails, amputation of fingers, or opening fistulas or abscesses, where life would not be endangered by the operation, and where the patient fell a sacrifice under its use, uncalled for and not demanded by the exigency of the case.

I am not prepared, however, to say I would never use anæsthetic agents. I would only use them with a full consideration of the possible consequence the object sought to be attained by their administration. I would carefully decide whether, under all the attending circumstances, the anticipated benefit would be a full and ample equivalent for the danger to be apprehended, and which might result from their administration.

I would never use them in trivial or minor operations, but alone in those cases where from the severity and length of the operation or labor, or the nature of the disease, life would be placed in imminent danger by not using them. In those cases, I should prefer ether to chloroform, except in a diseased state of the lungs. It is more gradual and slow in its operation, and I apprehend more safe, with the exception I have named.

All which is respectfully submitted.

E. T. FOOTE, M.D.

New Haven, May 18th, 1852.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Of the Am. Inst. of Hom. to address the Homœopathic Physicians of the United States.

The American Institute of Homœopathy to its members sends greeting and congratulation:—because of the happy progress which our science continues to make, not only in its resources, to which each day adds something, but also because of the rapidly increasing estimation which it obtains from intelligent and enlightened people.

Its promulgation being nearly coeval with the commencement of the present century, it may be considered as the child of this age—an age in which man has pressed his investigations of nature to a far greater extent and with more stupendous results than his history justifies us in believing that he ever attained before. Franklin, who “eripuit cœlo fulmen sceptrum que tyrannis,”* had but recently fulfilled his great mission; Galvanus had just commenced those investigations which, afterwards continued and augmented by Volta and others, led through the discovery of galvanic electricity to that of electro-magnetism, which has gifted us with the electric telegraph, when Hahnemann, from observations as just and experimentation as simple and rational as that of the philosophers just named, was brought to recognise the existence of a law of cure. This law you know so well that it is now unnecessary to define it, and the immense benefits accruing from its discovery and application are too obvious to require recapitulation.

But happy and useful as is this discovery, and its concomitant, that of the operation of extremely minute doses, they have met with the sternest opposition. For even in this time, when wonders are almost daily developed by the exercise of human intelligence, there are those who, in every stage of his progress, scout the discoverer, and prognosticate his discomfiture. There are those who seek to keep us where we are, or rather where we have been,

and whose every opinion and act tend to draw mankind back into the gloom and ignorance of the dark ages. They endeavour to cast obstacles in the way of advancement, and seek to deter every free, adventurous, and noble spirit from pressing onward. They raise a shout over every failure for the triumph of their superior sagacity; forgetful that often ere the ink which was employed in their demonstrations of impossibility had become dry, the impossible thing was in constant practical application; forgetful, too, that it is equally ridiculous to adhere to an old error as to adopt a new one.

They have treated Homœopathia as they have treated all other newly-discovered truths. They have demonstrated to their own satisfaction that it is absurd. This they have done not by observation but by inspiration, an inspiration which teaches them the facts in nature, and enables them to dispense with dull, plodding, and laborious observation and experiment.

We know that the ordeal of opposition is a probation to which all doctrines or announcements of discovery, whether true or false, are almost of necessity subjected. And as there are always such as “would rather err with Galen than be circulators with Harvey,” the violence of opposition affords no proof of their falsity or of their truthfulness. The homœopathist, building upon confirmed facts, knows the value of his position, and seeks no unnecessary supports for that which rests upon a secure and immovable basis. He may sometimes show that real discoverers have generally been persecuted, but he does not infer that because he who proclaimed a discovery was persecuted, that therefore he was a discoverer. This would be to argue as irrationally as his opponents, who, showing that nonsensical notions have been adopted at times in medicine, infer from this that Homœopathia must therefore be ridiculous. But the truth is the fact in nature, and the first positive demonstration of this fact is the discovery of this truth.

That Homœopathia has advanced, and is advancing in spite of the most virulent opposition, is certainly gratifying, and you should not be severely censured if you enjoy a little the discomfiture of vindictive and unscrupulous opponents. But there is a higher and more honourable gratification, in comparison with which that arising from mere victory is mean and contemptible. This is the satisfaction which the man of probity, exalted intelligence, and high religious sentiment, must experience from the conviction that he has been usefully labouring in the furtherance of the progress of man to greater attainment and happiness; from knowing that he has put his talents to use, and lo! they have become other five talents, in fulfilment of the law of Creative Wisdom, who has gifted him with reason, which he is to exercise upon the things around him; and that to idly receive the legends of the past, to obey them, and to hand them down to posterity, is a machinal operation compared to that of em-

* “Snatched the thunder from heaven, and the sceptre from tyrants.”

ploying reason to seek facts by means of observation, to weigh evidence, and to arrive at true conclusions for purposes of utility.

Let it not be supposed for an instant that we despise the records of the past, or that, in our admiration of new discoveries, we lose respect for old truths. These are ever valuable, in whatever age of the world they first became known. To the discoveries made long since, the physician as well as the astronomer is indebted for the capability of making further advances in his science. "A thousand years roll by; the astronomer stands on the watch-tower of Babylon, and writes for posterity the records of an eclipse; this record escapes destruction, and is safely wafted down the stream of time. A thousand years roll away; the old astronomer, surrounded by the fierce but wandering Arab, again writes and marks the day which witnesses the sun's decay. A thousand years roll heavily away; once more the astronomer writes, from amidst the gay throng that crowds the capital of Europe. Record is compared with record, date with date, revolution with revolution, the past and the present together—another struggle commences—another triumph is won. Little did the Babylonian dream that he was observing for one who, after a lapse of three thousand years, should rest upon this very record the successful resolution of one of Nature's darkest mysteries."*

Recognising then the fact, that Medicine is a science capable of improvement, and requiring it, we may hope that this Institute will not become an instrument of conservatism, to preserve the present limitations of science, and to say to the aspirant after greater knowledge, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther;" but that, serving as a point of concentration for information from distant places and numerous sources, it may be able to reflect in every direction, in a condensed and well-arranged form, much that is valuable, which might otherwise be lost.

Remembering that physicians now possess advantages over their predecessors, in additional observations with improved means of observing, the Institute views the submission of the present to the past, an homage to the intelligence of the latter at the expense of an insult to our own. It, therefore, invites its members; and, if it be permitted to extend its voice beyond the limits of our own association, it feelingly invites our brethren in medicine, the physicians of every school, to give a calm consideration to the following propositions and advice.

The profession of healing the sick is both highly useful and responsible. Much good or much evil may result from its exercise, according to the proper or improper employment of the means within our reach for this purpose. These means, and their suitable methods of application, are only known from observation and experience. Let us then, laying aside all

prejudices, honestly and industriously inquire into the facts in nature, and let these, when substantiated, be the basis of our opinions and practice. Let us avoid every arbitrary doctrine, every antiquated and superstitious notion, and every modern conceit, which have no facts to support them; and then, although there will always be individual jealousies, the profession will rapidly advance in usefulness to the human race.

On behalf of the Committee,

JACOB JEANES.

May 19th, 1852.

As our Journal was about to be sent to the press, we received the July number of the "American Magazine, devoted to Homœopathy and Hydropathy," which proves that the opinion we expressed of that periodical at its commencement was not far from the truth. We then intimated that it was "eclectic" in its character, and the number before us sustains that opinion, so it seems to us. A fierce attack is made upon the Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy, on account of its advocacy of pure, unmixed Homœopathy. Dr. W. A. Gardiner, the editor of the Philadelphia Journal, does not need our aid in his defence, for he is fully competent to defend himself and Homœopathy. The editor of the magazine has several times said that the American Institute of Homœopathy had adopted what he calls Hydropathy, which is a mistake. The facts are these:—several years ago the Institute appointed our late colleague, Dr. R. A. Snow, a committee to report on the water treatment of diseases. At the next meeting of the Institute, after his appointment, Dr. Snow reported in part, and the subject was recommitted to him, and before the next meeting of the Institute, Dr. Snow had gone to the world of spirits. Some two years afterwards, the committee on publication of the proceedings of the Institute, were requested to obtain Dr. S.'s report and in its order publish it, which they did. The Institute never heard it read, never debated the subject, and never voted on it. The Institute of Homœopathy has never committed the folly of attempting to decide scientific subjects by vote; and it is distinctly avowed in its proceedings for 1848 (we quote from memory), that it will not sanction or express an opinion of any doctrines contained in papers read before it, nor is the publication of such papers or reports in its proceedings to be regarded as an

* Lecture by C. Mitchell.

approval or otherwise of the contents of said papers or reports. This was the substance of the resolution offered by ourself, and adopted unanimously by the Institute; consequently Dr. Gatehell, of the Magazine, fails in his attempt to make the American Institute of Homœopathy sanction formally his views of the water treatment. We ought to remark, further, that the Institute at its meetings allows free discussion of any doctrine that may come before it, but invariably it has refused to undertake by a vote to decide any scientific question. The Institute has adopted but one principle, the law of cure, *similia similibus curantur*. We have no room for further remarks.

HOMŒOPATHIC HOSPITAL IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

The friends of Homœopathy in this city are becoming interested in the establishment of a Hospital for the Homœopathic treatment of diseases. To accomplish the organisation of such a Hospital will require a good deal of money, but it is in the hands of an efficient committee of gentlemen, whose benevolence, moral standing, and pecuniary independence, are well known to our citizens generally, and we do not doubt that the requisite funds will soon be secured, and the Institution organised without delay. It is not our business, nor is it necessary, to suggest a plan for the Hospital; the trustees, with such counsel as they may seek, will adopt the best plan for the benefit of the sick, as well as the promotion of the interests of Homœopathy.

This Hospital will doubtless become one of the best schools in our country for teaching the principles and practice of medicine and surgery. It is now admitted that the ordinary lectures in the colleges are insufficient, to say nothing of the doctrines taught in them, to constitute a thorough physician, but instruction at the bedside of the sick is essential for that purpose, and it cannot be conducted so well as in a Hospital.

ANECDOTE.

Dr. Hering, whilst travelling in Germany, saw an old gentleman who had suffered much under many doctors, who all treated him dif-

ferently. He at last, however, determined to take no more medicine until he should find three doctors who would all agree upon his case," and for this purpose he was travelling, and had, when Dr. Hering saw him, consulted 477 physicians, who wrote for him 832 recipes, containing 1097 different remedies. He requested Dr. Hering to prescribe, but he declined it, and asked him if Hahnemann were not among the number he consulted. With a smile he turned to No. 301, name of disease O, remedy prescribed O. "That was the wisest man of the lot," said he, "for he said that the name of the remedy did not concern me, but that the cure was the essential point." "But why," I enquired, "did you not allow him to treat you?" "Because," said he, "he is but two, and I must have three who agree." Dr. Hering said, if he were willing to sacrifice some hundred francs in the experiment, he would find not *three*, but *thirty-three* physicians who would agree in his case, to which he acceded. A description of his disease was then made out and sent to thirty-three homœopathic physicians. He shortly after wrote to Dr. Hering, saying, "I send you wine of the year 1822, because twenty-two physicians agree respecting my case. I thereby perceive that there is certainly such a thing in this world as twenty-two physicians who have fixed upon the same remedy." He took the remedy, and got cured.

The New York Homœopathic Dispensary, corner of Broadway and Broome street, is open daily, from 12 to 1, and from 4 to 5 o'clock. We understand the number of patients prescribed for, is about three hundred weekly.

Homœopathic physicians will find Dr. C. Von Bönninghausen's paper highly interesting, and we ask for it a careful reading.

The Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy for July has just reached us. It is a capital number. This Journal ought to be sustained. It is what it purports to be, a Journal of Homœopathy.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G. R. W.—We think we are not mistaken. We have in many cases witnessed violent “aggravations” of diseases from the high attenuations of drugs, even to the 1600th. If you repeat these or any other attenuations, at short intervals, say 24 or 48 hours, or, in some cases, in less than two weeks, you will in all likelihood not perceive the aggravation, and may fail of the curative effects of the drug. For example, *Sulphur*, of the 30th and upwards, will not, in most cases of chronic diseases, when indicated, cause an “aggravation” until about the tenth day after its administration. These aggravations are of great practical importance in acute as well as chronic diseases, for if they exist and are overlooked, and set down to the progress of the disease, uninfluenced by the drug, and then you administer other drugs, the case becomes confused thereby, and not unlikely a cure defeated. The more experience we have in homœopathic practice, the more cautious we grow in the selection and repetition of drugs.

J. W. wishes to know what attenuation we use in our practice. We seldom administer any drug under the 30th. If a drug is strikingly indicated, covering all, or nearly so, of the symptoms of the disease, as often happens in the different forms of scarlet fever, as well as most other diseases, we use the 200th, and seldom, in fact we may say never repeat it. We wait patiently, relying upon the one dose, until another drug is distinctly demanded by a change in the symptoms of the patient. Let it be understood that we search for the appropriate drug until all doubts are gone from our mind, and then we feel safe in doing as above stated. This mode of practice is attended with a great deal of labor, but the favorable result is a gratifying compensation. Formerly we repeated the remedy frequently, but we think we have adopted a “more excellent way.”

W. J. R.—You ask my advice, as you have just undertaken the practice of Homœopathy. Never attempt to be what is termed “a ready, off-hand prescriber.” Many have split upon this rock. Make it a rule, and on no account depart from it, to examine the *Materia Medica Pura* whenever you prescribe. Be cautious how you rely alone on *Repertories*, especially the clinical remarks found in them, which are, in most instances, worthless. Depend upon it, there is no short and easy method to the practice of Homœopathy. Never allow yourself to be hurried by patients or their friends; take time to deliberate, and by a careful examination of the patient and of the *Materia Medica*, be sure you have selected the remedy, and as it is certain in its effects, you can calmly wait for it to do its work. You may ask, but suppose it does not relieve, what am I to do? We answer, 1st. The case may be incurable, and, unless careful, the true homœopathic remedy may hasten on the disease. 2d. If it be a curable case, the first dose, if rightly chosen, and sufficiently attenuated, will show its beneficial effects, in regard to time, as a general rule, according to the acuteness of the disease, or its natural course. If it be, for example, an *acute pleurisy*, and *Aconite* indicated, you may look

for a mitigation of the symptoms from one dose, within six or eight hours, and if the patient continues to improve, you should not repeat the *Aconite*. But if a change in the symptoms takes place, indicating another drug, it is to be given at any time. Bear in mind this, that time *per se* for the repetition of drugs in the treatment of diseases never had any basis in the old school, and we are sure it has none in the new school. Pay no attention, therefore, to time, but to the actual condition of the patient, give a drug when it is demanded by the symptoms, and when once given, let it alone until there is a demand for another or the same, no matter how long or how short the time. It is true there are long acting and short acting drugs; this fact should not be overlooked, but sometimes a short acting remedy will influence some persons for a long time. We do not know of any fixed law on this subject, your own judgment must direct you.

Above all things be most careful not to fix upon a single prominent symptom, however distressing to the patient, and undertake to remove that as if it were everything in the case; by doing so you go at one leap into Allopathy. For example, some diseases have sleeplessness for one, two or three days; now, if you undertake to remove this symptom by itself, of necessity you will reason as an allopath, and will prescribe as one virtually, and will fail in your object, but if you succeed, it will be by large doses, and then your case is so disfigured that you cannot select the homœopathic remedy. We have seen this in hundreds of instances. One symptom is not the disease, but it takes them all to make it up. Technically speaking, homœopaths are not symptomatologists, these treat one symptom at a time; but the homœopaths take all the symptoms at once, which constitutes what is revealed of the disease, in fact, all of the disease. Therefore it is homœopaths are the only practitioners who treat the whole disease at the same time; while allopaths treat the symptoms one by one, at any rate they seek to do so, and we regret to say that too many who take rank in our school try to do the same thing, and call it homœopathic practice. If you have doubt about this statement, look into almost any work on the allopathic practice of medicine, and examine the first prescription you happen to open to if it contain some half dozen drugs, and you will see that each one is directed to a particular symptom, and it is expected that one by one they will be killed off under the mandate of the physician. We repeat that homœopaths are not symptomatologists, but allopaths are so. The former use the symptoms as a whole to designate the disease, and when they direct the remedy to the whole of the symptoms at once, they reach effectually the internal morbid state, which is concealed from view. The one treats the symptoms, and the other the disease.

This Journal can be had regularly of Rademacher & Sheek, No. 239 Arch street, Philadelphia; also of Otis Clapp, Boston.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, AUGUST, 1852.

NO. 4.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

ON THE USE OF HIGH ATTENUATIONS IN HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE.

By DR. C. VON BÖNNINGHAUSEN, OF MUNSTER, WESTPHALIA.

Concluded from page 29.

9. (Vol. 78, page 145). Sophia S—, an infant, six months old, was suddenly seized with an attack of quinsy, which speedily gained ground, threatening the life of the child. When I was called in, the case exhibited every sign of gravity and danger, which was the more serious, as two hours had already elapsed since it had taken this turn.

I found all the usual symptoms, such as heat and redness of the face, hoarseness, cough sounding like croup, rattling in the throat when the child falls asleep.

March 21, 1851. 1, *Acon.* 200; 2, *Hep. sulph. calc.* 200; 3, *Spongia*, 200; 4, *Hep. sulph. calc.* 200. One powder to be taken every five hours.

After the second powder, the infant was already perfectly cured, and there was accordingly no need to administer 3 and 4. I mention this case here to show that high dynamizations are quite in their place in acute diseases. For several years I have invariably used, in croup and other acute diseases, the 200th attenuation, and this without ever failing once in my object.

10 (Vol. 78, page 151). H. S—, goldsmith, aged 34 years; has since three years been affected with a severe cough, attended with retching, and often with vomiting, which gives some relief; the expectoration is scanty and insipid. The cough comes on every morning, immediately after the patient has partaken of food or drink; also after smoking, but most severely after drinking wine. He ascribes the origin of the cough to the sudden ingestion of very hot coffee. At a former period he had the itch, which was treated with *Sulphur* and *Soap*; and also gonorrhœa, which was suppressed by *Copaiva* and *Merc.* (the latter in doses of six grains.)

I could not ascertain from the patient what medicines he had taken up to the time of his application to me. He could inform me only that *Oleum Crotonis* and *Pimpinella* were

of the number, but that he had never derived the slightest benefit from any of the preparations prescribed for him.

March 22, 1851. 1, *Nux Vomica* 200; 2, *Ipecacuanha* 200; 3, *Nux Vomica* 200; 4, ϕ . One powder to be taken every third evening.

April 14. Twenty-four hours after the administration of the first powder, a considerable improvement manifested itself, and continued up to the present time. The morbid symptoms now make their appearance only after drinking, and no longer after eating. The patient feels a kind of narrowing or contraction in the urethra when urinating. 1, *Ars.* 3000; 2 to 4, ϕ . One powder to be taken every fifth evening.

Three weeks after he felt perfectly cured; and as I have neither seen him nor heard from him since, although he could come to me by rail in about an hour's time, I think I may assume that he continues to enjoy good health.

11. (Vol. 78, page 153). A. C—, a boy, aged 13, has been affected since two years with *tinea favosa*, on the hairy scalp, and with *herpes farin.* (*pityriasis*), spread in small isolated spots all over the body. In other respects the boy is well.

In this case various ointments, oils, and soaps had been used, and also *Mercury*, but all without the desired effect.

March 23, 1851. 1, *Sulphur* 2000; 2, *Sulphur* 4000; 3, ϕ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

April 19. Considerable improvement. 1, *Sulphur* 6000; 2 to 4, ϕ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

May 26. Improvement, but less marked than the last time. 1, *Calc. carb.* 2000; 2 to 4, ϕ . One powder to be taken every eighth day.

July 7. Further considerable improvement. Most of the spots are completely healed. 1, *Silicea* 4000; 2 to 4, ϕ . One powder to be taken every eight days.

After this the eruption vanished completely. The skin assumed the natural healthy color, and up to this day the boy continues in good health.

12. (Vol. 78, page 174). A. A—, an infant about 12 months old, son of a teacher; about six months ago reddish spots appeared about the ears, and afterwards on his face, hands and arms. The allopathic medicines which

were administered to the child only had the effect of causing the eruption to spread over the rest of the body. The way in which the eruption proceeds and runs its course is as follows: At first the skin gets red, and a little discharge makes its appearance; afterwards a yellow crust forms, with purulent matter underneath it; in the course of a few days the crust turns to a dark brown or blackish color, and finally scales off, but is speedily replaced by another red spot, which then goes through the same course, and so on. The father, mother, and grandmother of the child had, in their time, suffered from similar eruptions.

I could not ascertain from the parents what were the allopathic medicines hitherto administered to the infant. They could only inform me that the poor little patient had been made to drink copiously of tea of *Viola tricolor* (Jacea).

March 29, 1851. 1, *Sulph.* 2000; 2, *Psor* 2000; 3, *Sulph.* 4000; 4 δ . One powder to be taken every fifth day.

April 26. Considerable improvement in all the symptoms. 1, *Calc. carb.* 2000; 2 to 4 δ . One powder every fifth day.

After this the eruption disappeared altogether, and the child continues well up to this day.

13. (Vol. 78, page 209). P. R—, a girl, aged 18 years; has been subject since five years to epileptic attacks, which appeared formerly at longer intervals, but latterly they have become much more frequent, often five or six times in a day. During the attacks, there is yellowness of the face, bluish color around the eyes, and entire loss of consciousness; the attacks last at least five minutes; the menses come too soon and too strong; before and during the accession the patient suffers from spasms in the abdomen, sometimes also headache; anxiety at the appearance of the attacks; without pains or other sensations; black spots only under the eyes, with blue lips; much coldness; no thirst; she is better in the morning; oppressed in the warm room; formerly suffered much from ascarides; temper irritable; uneasy by strong motion, palpitation of the heart; without anxiety.

Although the allopath knows that such cases are incurable, she has nevertheless taken a variety of drugs.

April 8, 1851. 1, $\ddagger$ 2000; 2 to 4, δ . A powder every third evening.

April 29. The attacks very much diminished, and only before and after the period; a few attacks; none in the interval; also better in other respects, and looks better. In the beginning of the menses, cramps in the abdomen. 1, *Cuprum met.* 2000; 2 to 4, δ . Like the former, every third evening.

May 19. After some time, strong epileptic attacks, during and before the menses, with much coldness and pains in the hips; she is very melancholy and irritable before the

monthly indisposition. 1, *Calc. carb.* 200; 2 to 4, δ . As before.

June 3. Has had no fresh attack. 1 to 4, δ . As before.

June 23. A strong epileptic attack at the appearance of the menses, which were copious. 1 *Calc. carb.* 3000, 2 to 4 δ . As before.

July 9. No attack the last fourteen days, although she was exposed at times to much mental excitement. 1 to 4, δ . As before, every third evening.

July 24. Many strong attacks during the time of the monthly illness, with soreness and burning in the parts. I suspect masturbation. 1, *Phosphor.* 2000; 2 to 4 δ . As the former.

September 18. She remained well until the last eight days, when she again suffered from an attack at the time of the monthly appearance. 1, *Nux vom.* 200; 2 to 4, δ ; 3, *Natrum mur.* 2000. A powder every fifth evening.

October 25. Soon after (3 *Natrum mur.*) she had, at the time of the menses, a strong attack, but has remained free since that time.

Time will show if this be a cure and permanent.

14. (Vol. 78, page 217). C. S—, a girl, 13 years of age, of a delicate constitution; was first attacked with diarrhœa, which had been checked by allopathic means; this was followed by a severe, hard, dry cough, which has continued more than four months; it is worse in the evening, and in the fresh air; the child is very much reduced; pain in the chest when coughing, and strong perspiration in the evening while in bed. The child feels much better when in a warm room; stitches in the temples when coughing; aversion to fat and vegetables; had a humid eruption around the chin, and there are still to be seen a few red spots; humid eruptions on the head. The mother had, during pregnancy with this child, an eruption over the whole body.

The allopathic remedies produced no effect, amongst which were particularly *Ammon. muriat.*, *Columbo*, *Opium*, *Rheum*, *Cascar.* and *Spirit Mindereri*. As the last resource, refuge was taken in Homœopathy.

April 10, 1851. 1 to 3, *Hep. sulph. calc.*; 2, *Spongia*, of each 200; 4, δ . A dose every fifth evening.

May 3. Something better; dry cough in the evening, particularly affected by tobacco-smoke. 1, *Petrol.* 200; 2 to 4, δ . As the former.

May 26. Better in every respect. 1, *Petrol.* 2000; 2 to 4, δ . After which perfect restoration to health.

15. (Vol. 78, page 220.) T. P—, an unmarried lady, aged 50 years; has suffered since youth from headache. Having consulted many physicians without receiving the least benefit, she submitted to her fate, and took no more medicine. She was advised by her friends to consult me; she called, but was incredulous in the highest degree. The headache before men-

tioned still exists; pressure on the top of the head, generally worse before noon, but often increasing towards evening, also during motion; worse in a warm room; vomiting of everything except animal food; shortness of breath in walking; sleep good; the menses, which have now ceased, were formerly scanty; much overpowering heat; violent and irritable temper, and during the headache much crying. She has been subject to fits of vomiting from her youth.

April 12, 1851. 1, *Nux vomica* 1000; 2 to 4, ϕ . Every fifth evening.

May 12. She remained free from headache until the end of the last week, to her great astonishment; it again appeared with violent shooting (not pressing) on the top of the head, accompanied with sour and bitter vomiting; eruption on the right eye-brow. 1, *Sepia* 200; 2 to 4, ϕ . Of each powder, dissolved in water, during three consecutive evenings, a spoonful; nothing the two following evenings.

May 29. She had a very severe attack, which lasted but one day; some headache; but in the morning, in bed, a creeping, crawling sensation in the hands. 1, *Sepia* 2000; 2 to 4, ϕ . Like the former.

June 20. No headache, and is now quite well. 1, *Sepia* 4000; 2 to 4, ϕ . Like the former.

Nothing more was necessary; all the sufferings she has had for so many years have entirely ceased. She has now full confidence in our mode of practice.

16. (Vol. 78, page 225). C. W—, a girl, 14 years of age, from the country. She is confined to bed and has been in bad health for a year; she formerly suffered from an eruption on the top of the head, which has been suppressed allopathically by ointments; since that time constant headache with sickness, worse in the evening, and when moving; pain in the hips, worse in the evening and during motion; sickness after every meal; chilliness; no perspiration while in bed; a desire for salt; an aversion to milk; great weakness, so that she can scarcely bear being out of bed for a few moments. She has been treated allopathically for a long time without the least benefit.

April 14, 1851. 1, *Sulphur* 2000; 2, *Sulphur* 4000; 3 and 4, ϕ . A powder every fifth evening.

May 12. Considerably better. 1, *Sulphur* 6000; 2 to 4, ϕ . Like the former.

This long-suffering young person is now in excellent health. *Sulphur*, in a high dynamization, was the only remedy used.

17. (Vol. 78, page 230.) N. L—, a boy, aged eight years, has been sickly for four years, but has become worse the last two months from the effects of whooping-cough; violent cough, with sweetish expectoration, which is worse when beginning to move in the room, and after walking in the open air; much vomiting in the evening and at night, mostly mucus, but once lately blood; aversion

to fat; feels chilly; no thirst; frequent bleeding of the nose at night; very bashful and timid. He was attacked in the winter with the measles, after which he had hooping-cough.

He has for a long time been treated allopathically, and has taken a variety of drugs; latterly, much *Ferr. acet.* and *Ammon. muriat.*

April 17, 1851. 1 to 3, *Pulsatilla*; 2, *Sulphur*, of each 200; 4, ϕ . A dose every fifth evening.

May 9. Considerably better; the boy is scarcely to be recognised. 1, *Sulphur* 2000; 2 to 4, ϕ ; 3, *Pulsatilla* 200.

These remedies were sufficient to remove all diseased symptoms, and his health is now better than it has ever been.

18. (Vol. 78, page 275). H. H—, aged 22 years; suffered for ten years from caries and enlargement of the bone of the whole right leg, with its toes; the leg is considerably swelled, which aches and burns; and from six holes there runs constantly a watery, sometimes bloody and very ichorous discharge. During the winter, the pain in the leg ceases, when he suffers from a severe cough. At the approach of spring, the pains in the leg increase, and the cough ceases. He is compelled to walk with crutches. He has been under allopathic treatment ten years without receiving any benefit.

April 27, 1851. 1 to 3, *Silicea*; 2, *Hep. sulph. calc.* of each 200; 4, ϕ . A powder every fifth evening; and to cover the suppurating holes with tallow and lint.

May 25. Much improved. 1, *Hep. sulph. calc.* 2000; 2 to 4, ϕ . To be taken like the former.

June 15. Continued improvement; suppuration continues. 1, *Silicea*, 4000; 2 to 4, ϕ . Like the former.

July 6. Great improvement, as expected; several holes closed; the pains have entirely ceased. He has put aside the crutches. 1 to 4, ϕ . Like the former.

August 3. Continued improvement. 1, *Silicea* 6000; 2 to 4, ϕ . As before.

August 31. Again considerable progress. He does not only go without crutches, but has walked to-day a distance of six miles, and will walk the same distance in the afternoon. 1 to 4, ϕ . As before.

September 28. Much improved in health; but two holes still suppurate, particularly that of the great toe; all the others are closed, and the foot which was so much swollen has now assumed its usual size. 1 to 4, ϕ . As the former.

October 19. Since eight days there seems to be a check in the improvement; there is still a hole which still suppurates; the pain has entirely ceased; he takes much exercise throughout the day. 1, *Hep. sulph. calc.* 3000; 2 to 4, ϕ . To use like the others.

Although the cure is not completed, yet we

have no doubt that the result will be favorable. My object in communicating this case is to show that even in similar complaints the high potencies exert their action.

19. (Vol. 78, page 279). H. B—, a young man, aged 18 years, suffered since two years (after the death of his brother, who died from consumption, he had slept in his bed until the last moment) from shortness of breath, as if the chest were tightened by a bandage; expectorating in the morning some sweetish, putrid matter; great hunger, with a general decline; after a meal, he is a little better for half an hour, otherwise he is worse from nine o'clock in the morning until seven o'clock in the evening, when he rests.

He has taken much medicine for two years, but I could not ascertain of what kind.

April 28. 1, *Phosphorus* 2000; 2 to 4, ϕ . Each powder to be dissolved in three teaspoonfuls of water, and to take one for three evenings consecutively, and then to stop two evenings.

May 15. Was much better, however, and took coffee after the use of the four powders, and now he complains of shooting pains in the chest, and a sensation as if something had been torn away; worse in the morning and at noon; better after a meal. 1, *Nux romica* 2000; 2 to 4, ϕ ; 3, *Phosphorus* 4000. Like the former; after which he was entirely well.

20. I conclude with the cure of a bird. The professor of languages to my children called eight days ago to tell me that two of his canary birds had died, and the third was about to die, apparently of the same complaint. The bird ate constantly in the cage, but everything passed from him undigested. *Pulsatilla* 2000, cured him completely, to the great astonishment of the professor.—*Homœopathic Times*.

STRAY NOTES.

BY AN OLD PRACTITIONER.

Vitalism and Vetulism.

These two terms perhaps read, look, and sound as well in juxtaposition, and convey at least as clear and distinct ideas, as the names Homœopathy and Allopathy. The word vitalism, of course, needs no explanation, its meaning in relation to our system is at once perceived by whosoever has rightly understood Hahnemann's doctrine. Of vetulism I said, in a previous article, that it appeared to me the most appropriate term by which to designate the ordinary mode of treating disease, and I promised to justify so uncomplimentary a title forthwith.

When we speak of medical art in the ordinary sense of the word, we simply mean the therapeutic branch of medicine; and speaking of therapeutics, we mean, in the same sense,

almost exclusively, the application of those dynamic agents generally called medicines. It is, of course, essential that a medical man, before he makes use of medicines for the cure of disease, should know what the therapeutic properties of these agents are. In Homœopathy the trial of the medicines on persons in health is the principle which reveals to the practitioner their therapeutic virtues; but allopathy has no such principle. It has endeavored to find it in chemical investigation and has failed; it has scrutinised the smell, taste, form, color, and the physical properties of medicinal substances, and has been disappointed; it has tried its medicines upon animals, and has tortured the poor creatures in vain; it has thought that certain plants and minerals would exhibit their medicinal properties according to their position in the modern system of botany and mineralogy, and has found itself mistaken. Finally, in despair, it has thrown itself into the arms of conjecture and empiricism. The latter, however (*usus in morbis*, the use or rather abuse in disease), is the sheet-anchor of the ordinary therapeutics; a medicine is given in a case of disease, *because it has produced, or is said to have produced beneficial effects in similar cases*. Now this same sheet-anchor of the principal portion of the ordinary allopathic art is also the sheet-anchor in the ordinary "old woman's" practice. An "old woman" (*vetula*) recommends and gives her medicines exactly upon the same meagre principle as the allopath, *ab usu in morbis*; therefore, as far as principle is concerned (aye, and practice, too), there is hardly a difference between allopathy and vetulism; and if there is, it is rather in favor of the "old woman" than of the allopath. For her "system" is as old as mankind itself; she generally gives simples, and does not mix half a dozen powerful medicines together; she thereby does infinitely less harm, and can follow the effects of such simples with much greater clearness and precision than the allopath can the effects of his mixtures. Moreover, she seldom or never bleeds, leeches, salivates, cuts, and burns, as the allopath does; and last, though not least, she never tries to deck out her simple experience in tawdry rags of subtle theory and clumsy speculation. I need not pursue the subject further, and shall only add, that taking these various facts into consideration, one arrives, through an easy *sortes*, at the inevitable and strictly syllogistic conclusion, not only that allopathy does not essentially differ from "old woman's" practice (vetulism), but also, what on the whole experience confirms, that it is safer to intrust the treatment of disease to a cautious "old woman," than to a drugging, drenching, bleeding, leeching, salivating, blistering, cutting, and burning allopath, with his raw and coarse notions of the therapeutic properties of medicines, and of the susceptibility of the organism in a state of disease.

Is Allopathy a System?

Science, in a philosophical sense, consists in carefully-ascertained data, and the laws, principles, and rules derived from them through cautious induction. Science becomes a *system* when these isolated laws, principles and rules are intimately connected with, depend upon, and verify each other, and thus severally contribute, like the different parts of a healthy organism, to form a symmetrical whole. The most perfect form of a system is that which has, as a centre, some comprehensive law of nature, or some supreme principle from which all the other parts depend, and round which they harmoniously gravitate.

To this most perfect form of a system Homœopathy has a right to lay claim. In the homœopathic system of therapeutics, as taught by Hahnemann, the law *similia similibus* is the great centre; the principle of trying the medicines on the healthy body emanates from and is vitally connected with it; the principle of homœopathic doses and their preparation is derived and cannot be legitimately separated from the former; so also that of giving only one medicine at a time. Again, the homœopathic regimen is the necessary consequence of the other principles. Thus in this beautifully-constructed system all the different parts are closely connected with, vitally depending upon, and so indispensably necessary to each other, that none could be taken away without essentially injuring the whole edifice.

Let us compare with this the so-called *allopathic system*. Where is the great central principle of allopathic therapeutics? Where are the laws, principles, and rules which are admitted as such by all, or which even deserve any such name? Echo answers, Where? It is true, the history of medicine tells us that attempts without number have been made, from time to time, to give to medicine the form of a system. But what has become of them? has any of them survived? No; they were simply hot-house plants, which wanted the essential conditions of a healthy continuance of life, and bore at their very birth the germs of early decay and death within themselves. And why? Simply because they were either speculative systems spun *à priori* from the framer's brain without any or sufficient experimental foundation, or because undue and hasty inferences were drawn from loosely-observed and imperfectly-authenticated facts. How different and truly philosophical the method which Hahnemann followed in the construction of his system! It was only after the most careful and discriminating collection of facts for many years, and only when he found that such facts always led to the same inference, and always found their complete explanation in that inference, that he finally enunciated the great fundamental law of his doctrine. Thus in the course of years, and always guided by the strict rules of scientific investigation, he

at last produced his astonishingly complete system of therapeutics, the true spirit of which is fully understood, as yet, by only a small number of his professional followers, but will, let us hope, be fully appreciated by subsequent generations. In comparison with this structure, as solid and sure as laws of nature can make it, in what a pitiable light does that wretched allopathic farrago appear, which has hitherto been honored with the noble name of a therapeutic *system*, whilst in reality it is nothing else but a compound of silly speculations and crude, unscientific routine, which not only can never be called (except, perhaps, ironically) a system, but which is even unworthy to be termed a science in the proper sense of the word. Therefore, instead of calling it the allopathic *system*, or any other name which implies order, unity, and method, call it the *ordinary therapeutics*, the *ordinary mode of treating disease*; not even allopathy in juxtaposition with homœopathy; and if you must have a concise and expressive term, call it *VETULISM*.—*Homœopathic Times*.

SPECIMEN OF ALLOPATHIC PRACTICE.

The following very interesting case shows that the allopathic treatment in its heroic forms is, indeed, a very terrible affair. Observe the immense amount of depletion. The bleedings, the cuppings, the blisterings, the shavings of the head, the setons, the leeches, constitute such an awful picture of allopathic misdoing, that we really have not heart to comment on the treatment. But the publication of such cases cannot fail to benefit our Cause, by contrasting the two modes of therapeutics.

Those who use such practice seem to be altogether unaware that what they call "depletion," and even some of our own body do not seem to be aware, that "starvation" can bring about the state of things described in the report of the *post-mortem* examination. We are satisfied that such cases as this ought to be published; and from time to time we mean to give such cases, to let our readers know what allopathic practice is. We are indebted to the "Chrono-Thermalist" for this extract, and for that in a late number about the DUKE OF KENT.

"The case of Elizabeth Wilson, second daughter of William Carus Wilson, Esq., born at Casterton Hall, near Kirkby-Lonsdale, Westmoreland, on 22d June, 1800.

"She was strong and healthy till frightened at church, 9th December, 1818; bled, 16th December, 1818, then took her bed, and there remained for eleven years, subjected to the treatment detailed below; during which time 'she was never able to take any breakfast; her dinner consisted of a little fish, or something else of a light nature; but frequently she never tasted anything till the afternoon, and then only a little tea. Her nights were uni-

formly restless and sleepless. The throbbing and noise in her head were incessant, and the palpitations at her heart almost equally so. Sometimes distracted with pain in her teeth, and very often the whole of her mouth and throat was ulcerated or inflamed in the most excruciating manner, rendering her unable to speak or to eat' (p. 68).

<i>No. of Page in Memoir.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>State of Health, Sym- ptoms, &c.</i>	<i>Medical or Surgical Treatment.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
	1818.			
64	Dec. 9	Frightened at church.		Kirkby-Lonsdale is 1½ mile from Casterton; hence it must be manifest that if very ill and weak on the 15th, she could not have walked three miles.
73	" 15	Walked to Kirkby and was bled.	Bled, first time.	
65	" 16	Soreness at chest and headache.	Took her bed.	We must not omit noticing she was well till bled.
	" 22	In great danger.		
	1819.			
74	Jan. 22	Giddiness & trembling.	Cupped.	" During the years 1819 and 1820 her room was completely dark, she was unable to bear the light."—(p. 110.)
	" 30		Seton in back of neck.	
77	Feb. 2	Suffered by faintings.	Bled in the arm.	
82	" 9	Very low.		
87	" 10		Bled in the arm.	
	" 11		Cupped.	
	" 12		Bled.	" Yet felt the symptoms coming on again," viz., continual throbbing pains in the head.
88	" 13	Became worse.	Bled again.	
91	Aug. 27	In a state of stupor, with convulsions.		
	1820.			
93	Mar. 6	Dreadful pain in head.	Bled.	The memoir gives but a brief account of her physical state of this year and the following.
100	Nov. 4	Ditto ditto	Bled.	
	1821.			
106	Jan. 20		Cupped.	
	1822.			
185	Feb. 27	Fever very high.	Bled.	
	Mar. 1	Mouth ulcerated.		Query; whether by mer- cury?
	" 4	Very ill.	Bled.	
	" 14	Continued ditto	Cupped.	
	" 16	In great danger.	Bled.	
186	June 3	Very poorly.	Head shaved and cupped back of neck.	
187	July 17	Seized with feverish attack.		
189	Dec. 14	Poorly.		" First began to be ill four years ago."
	1823.			
195	Feb. 22	Very, very low.	Cupped.	
196	June 6	Violent fever and inflammation.	Bled.	" Seized suddenly very ill."
	" 7	Ditto.	Cupped and bled.	
197	" 10	Very bad in head.	Bled again.	" Rather relieved, but sick after everything."
200	Oct. 1	Violent spasms.		
201	Dec. 15	Very poorly.	Bled.	
	1824.			
205	Jan. 25	Very poorly.	Head shaved and a blister.	
	Feb. 10	Ditto.	Bled.	
	" 20	Very ill indeed.	Bled again.	
206	" 22	Very ill in her head.	Cupped.	" Rather relieved."
	" 25	Head as if all the skin was off inwardly.	Head shaved and blistered.	
208	May 29	Seized very ill.	Cupped and soon after bled.	" In a most suffering state," " Not one moment's ease."
	" 30			
	June 30	Weak and low.		
209	Oct. 25	Seized very ill.	Bled and cupped.	
	" 26	Still very ill.	Blister on head.	" In great suffering."
	" 27	Worse.	Bled again.	" Rather relieved."

No. of Page in Memoir.	Date.	State of Health, Sym- ptoms, &c.	Medical or Surgical Treatment.	Remarks. }
1825.				
213	June 10	Suffered very much.	Head shaved.	
	" 14	Very poorly.	Bled.	
	" 20	Suddenly very ill.	Bled.	
162	" 21	Very ill (morning).	Bled.	"Insensible, cold as a stone, rather better after bleed- ing; but delirium and restlessness soon came on."
	" 21	No better (evening).	Cupped on temple.	
	" 22	Still very ill.	Cupped on other temple, and head shaved and blistered.	
163	25 or 26	Same symptoms.	Same remedies.	"Dreadful vomiting and fainting, and strongly convulsed."
214	Nov. 5	Head heavy.	Bled.	
1826.				
220	Jan. 22	Pain in head.	Opium and a blister.	"Most distressing nights."
221	Mar. 13	Taken very ill.	Bled.	"Fainted sadly."
	" 15	Ditto.	Head shaved and blister put on.	
	" 16	Very feverish.		
166	June 24	Very ill.	Bled.	
1827.				
169 } 230 }	Apr. 21	Pain in side and fever.		
231	May 30	Constant headache.	Head shaved.	
	June 1	Ditto.	Cupped.	
	Aug. 31	Sore mouth and throat.	Blistered.	
232	Sept. 11	Ditto. ditto.	Another blister.	
	" 14	Feverish.		
233	Oct. 15	Seized suddenly ill.	Bled and a blister.	
	" 16	No better.	Bled again.	
	" 20	Suddenly worse.	Bled a third time.	"This relieved her head
	" 24	Very feverish.		"Fainted three times ; very, very ill.
1828.				
240	July 11	Pain in head.	Bled.	Much in the same state during the whole of the year; very low, with fever and pain in head.
1829.				
245	Jan. 14	Very feverish.		
	" 17	Whitlow on finger.		
	" 28	Toothache.		
246	Feb. 3	Face and toothache.	Leeches for toothache.	
	" 7	Toothache.	Blister.	
247	Mar. 13	Fever and thirst.		
	June 4	Seized suddenly ill.	Bled.	
	" 5	Very ill.	Leeches.	"Shattered frame, suffer- ing acutely.
	" 8	Very ill.	Bled.	
176	Dec. 26	Harassed & weakened by constant vomiting.		
	" 27	Sudden stupor came on.	Bled in the arm.	"She then came to her self."
1830.				
	Jan. 2	Delirium came on.		
	" 6	Fell asleep—died.		

"Appearances forty-six hours after death, from post-mortem examination. The Head. On removing the skull-cap, the substance of the bones was found to be very irregular. The natural depression and prominences were peculiarly strongly marked. The dura mater was more adherent in the course of the longitudinal sinus than usual, and the vessels on the surface were highly injected with blood; those over the anterior portion of the hemispheres of the brain evidencing recent inflammation, and those on the posterior part very great conges-

tion. The second membrane of the brain, the tunica arachnoidea was opaque in patches—also said to evidence recent inflammation—and gelatine was effused under it. Indeed, under the membrane a considerable quantity of serum was effused. The ventricles of the brain presented nothing unusual. The substance of the brain was much loaded with blood. Upon removing the brain, the base of the skull presented the same strongly-marked character of its usual depressions and prominences as the skull-cap; indeed in some parts

the prominences appeared like masses of adventitious bone—like so many points of unusual ossification. The petrous portions of the temporal bones in which the organ of hearing is developed, deviated considerably from the usual structure; inasmuch as they were remarkably attenuated and cellular, and easily fractured.

"The Chest.—Nothing remarkable but the heart, which was not more than half the usual size; its structure, however was proportionate.

The Abdomen.—Nothing remarkable presented itself here, beyond its contents partaking of the *general emaciation.*"*

MEDICAL TREATMENT OF HORSES.

We have long had it in our mind to speak of the medical treatment of horses; not that we are qualified to lay down rules of practice, but for the purpose of directing the attention of our readers who may be interested in the subject, to the homœopathic treatment of the diseases of the horse, and indeed all animals.

Notwithstanding the efforts made by the French government to improve knowledge of the diseases of the horse, and corresponding exertions of the veterinary college at London, assisted by the society for the diffusion of useful knowledge, the amount of ignorance still of the diseases of the horse and their treatment, is a subject that should command the attention of all humane people.

Although the homœopathic treatment of human maladies is no longer a doubtful hypothesis, but is fully established, yet how few are aware that homœopathy is as suitable to the diseases of the horse and other animals, as to those of man. Marked success has resulted from this treatment wherever it has been adopted. Diseases which heretofore have been thought incurable by the best veterinary surgeons, yield promptly to the new practice. We mention *phrenitis*, commonly known as "mad staggers," as an example among others.

We have frequently been pained at the brutal treatment we have witnessed in the management of sick horses, by ignorant persons, and it is to us a matter of surprise that these valuable animals are, often by their owners, committed to the hands of those entirely unfitted by nature or education, for the treatment of diseases, and thereby subjecting the

animal to the most severe tortures, and finally death. How preposterous the idea to allow so important and difficult a duty to be undertaken by persons in the most perfect ignorance of the nature of the subject, and whose delusions and superstitions could only excite our mirth, were it not for humanity's sake. As well send a watch to a horse shoer for repairs, or inquire of a hostler the laws of optics, or expect from him a dissertation on the atomic theory!!! And yet as much as this is contrary to the common sense of mankind, it is not more so, than to expect a proper treatment of disease from incapacity and ignorance.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

ALFRED HUGHES, M.D., of Wheeling, Va., writes: "I would almost as soon be without a bed to sleep upon as to be without your valuable Journal."

S. W. SUNDERLIN, M.D., of Hammondsport, Steuben Co., N. Y., writes: "The homœopathic practice in this part of the country is gaining the confidence of the people rapidly, especially among the intelligent and influential. Our allopathic brethren are making every effort in their power to prejudice the minds of the people against this practice, which is founded upon an immutable law of nature. I understand the medical society (allopathic) of this county, at one of its meetings, resolved that the members would not counsel with, countenance or associate with any homœopath."

[We do not perceive any value in medical consultations of practitioners of the two schools. Every true homœopath knows that the counsel of an allopath in the treatment of the sick is not only useless, but sometimes pernicious. All proceedings like those mentioned by Dr. Sunderlin never fail to promote the spread of Homœopathy. Truth cannot be put down in that or any other way. She will prevail.—ED.]

H. KNAPP, M.D., of Adrian, Michigan, writes: "Our cause is gloriously advancing in Michigan. The Old School practice is becoming more and more loathsome, and less and less popular with the public mind. I take all the Western Journals, and I want yours, that I may know how our cause is prospering east."

CHARLES BELL, M.D., of Medford, Mass.,

* The foregoing case is taken from a work entitled "Memoir of a Beloved and Long-afflicted Sister." By William Carus Wilson, M.A., rector of Whittington, 8vo., second edition. Seeley, London. 1842.

writes to us a very complimentary letter, and as we do not feel just at this time much of the influence of modesty, after some pretty severe back-handed blows we have lately received from some of our western newly fledged editors who have assumed that Homœopathy is almost as uncertain as Allopathy, and stands in need of the aid of Allopathy to keep her in countenance. Having no fellowship with that doctrine, and not being desirous for a war of words, we will let Dr. Bell speak for us, in the hope that those to whom we allude may at least give us credit for consistency and honesty. Dr. B. says: "I believe the calling of a Homœopathic Journalist among the most useful and reputable occupations. Since your inception as such I have watched with pleasure the earnestness with which you have sustained the character of your publication. I have also known with what attention and success you have acted as a practising physician.

"I wish your example was more effective in some places I could name. I am aware that those in active practice find the most palpable excuses from the work, but I know, also, there remains yet much to be done by the teachers of our system in this country, for the universal promulgation of its doctrines. In acting for years as the Editor of a highly scientific journal, and as an active practitioner of medicine, you have pursued a course for which the community and the profession should vote you thanks.

"A man may do everything in practice, may prescribe for fifty or more patients daily, and yet not do half as much in spreading the truth of science, as the journalist."

M. FRELIGH, M.D., of New York, writes: "I am happy to see the 'American Journal of Homœopathy' evincing, if possible, an increase of faith at every monthly issue. Its close adherence to the law founded upon the immutable basis of truth, and as promulgated by the immortal Hahnemann, *similia similibus curantur*, must not only recommend it to the careful perusal of every friend of Homœopathy, but produce a desire upon their part to extend its usefulness by a more general circulation and intimate acquaintance with the principles it so ably and so zealously advocates.

"Please send it to my friends G. L.—, M.D., and R. B.—, M.D., and consider them subscribers, commencing with the first number of the present volume."

HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The advertisement of the above college appears in our advertising columns, to which we ask the attention of students of medicine, as well as physicians who desire to acquire a knowledge of Homœopathy and its practice. This college was organised but a few years ago, and such has been its success, even in the midst of pretty strong opposition, that its permanency and usefulness are no longer doubtful.

We must admit that the faculty and the friends of the college have achieved in an unusually short time, more, much more, than we had anticipated at the commencement of the enterprise. Notwithstanding the prosperity of the "Homœopathic Medical College," there are yet, as usual, *croakers* even among homœopaths, but their voice is weak, and grows weaker every year, and finally will not be heard at all. It is surprising how few among physicians in this age of light, understand the principle and practice of toleration. If it were thoroughly studied and habitually practiced it would save us a world of trouble; but there are minds so warped and crisped that no scheme, no enterprise, however commendable, can prevent them from snapping and snarling, growling and grumbling, because everybody don't see with their eyes, and fall in with their intolerant spirit and impracticable plans.

In this country we are in the habit of forming a favorable opinion of that which is successful in practice. If we judge the college under notices by this rule, then we must conclude that it is managed with skill, and its faculty must be worthy the confidence of physicians, students, and the public.

In looking over the names of the professors we perceive that we have the honor of a personal acquaintance with all of them, with but a single exception, and we are happy in knowing that they are all sound in the faith, and imbued with the spirit of the doctrines of Homœopathy as taught by Hahnemann. There is not a mongrel or an eclectic among them; and for this reason alone we should think that every true homœopath would use his influence in favor of the "Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania." It is, to our mind, worthy of notice that the management of this college, composed, we believe, altogether of laymen, should have formed a faculty of seven

professors so harmonious in their views of Homœopathy, and so fraternal in their feelings to each other. They are men of great industry, of pure morals, and of talents of the right stamp for the present age, being more practical than ornamental.

We do not doubt that the graduates of this college will ultimately stand high in the estimation of the public; and for this reason—they will be taught the pure doctrine of Homœopathy, its practice as well as its principles, together with all the other branches necessary for an accomplished physician; and the visible industry of the professors will be an ever living example, the influence of which cannot be readily thrown off by the students when they enter upon the responsible duties of their professional life. These reflections carry us back almost thirty years, and although indolence has been a trouble to us, yet we feel to this day that the industry of Godman, of Hosack, of Mott, of Frances, of Bushe, and of others, lives in all its freshness in our mind.

This subject, to some, may seem a small matter for us to occupy the attention of the readers of this Journal with, and an unusual mode of speaking of a college; we however look upon it of great importance, and seeing its presence in the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania, we do not hesitate to mention it, although it may be unfashionable to do so.

For the New-York Journal of Homœopathy.

NEW-YORK, July 19, 1852.

Dr. Kirby,

DEAR SIR,—I perceive from your Journal that there is to be a proving of new remedies at the Institute, and I deeply regret that hydrophobia is not one of them, although I think it worth proving more than all the rest. With confidence, which rests on faithful analogical intentions, I look to it for curative efficacy, not only in a confirmed *Hydrophobia*, but in all those distressing maladies of the nerves on which the known resources of the healing art have been exhausted all in vain. How comes it, that, among so many zealous homœopathic students, enjoying health and youthful vigor, not one has dared yet to prove it on himself, and thus fulfil the most important of his duties? Hahnemann's disciples ought not to be such cravens. If homœopaths, from their numerical minority, have had no opportunity to try

this remedy, they should at least make sure of its specific virtues, so as to cut off all pretext for casting it aside, on the part of their heartless adversaries, who, it seems, will rather kill by *Chloroform*, or let the works of death go on *ad libitum*, than cure by any agent stained with the heresy of homœopathic mind and labor. It is quite time that the physician who, from such inhuman motives, spurns the only chance of saving the despairing patient, otherwise inevitably doomed, should be amenable to the supreme avenger—the TRIBUNAL OF THE PUBLIC.

AUTHOR OF

“HOMŒOPATHY REVEALED.”

UNIVERSITY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

The New York Academy of Medicine and the Medical Gazette are out in opposition to the above Institution. The latter is extremely violent, so much so that the Faculty of the University could well afford to contribute something to the support of the Gazette, because its opposition is the best kind of advertising. The former passed certain offensive resolutions which were sent to the Faculty, who replied that the University did not recognize its authority; and Dr. Mott resigned his membership of the Academy, which was a wise movement, but it would have been wiser if he had never united with it. The whole profession in this country looked upon Dr. Valentine Mott with pride. He is regarded as emphatically *the Surgeon of America*. We all respect him and love him. Many of us were deeply mortified when he formally connected himself with a *clique*, whose purposes were well known to be selfish and intolerant. He found the yoke of the Academy galling, and he threw it off. Dr. M. once more stands in a position where he can allow the overflowings of those liberal professional feelings with which he is known to be so largely endowed.

The Gazette vents its spite at Prof. Gunning S. Bedford, and in our opinion very unjustly. We doubt if Dr. Bedford has his equal, as a teacher of his branch. In this light he is to be viewed in relation to the University. Whatever there is in him objectionable, as a man, is not a proper subject for a journalist.

There are three Medical Colleges in this city. The College of Physicians and Surgeons

of the State of New York, the University of the city of New York, and the New York Medical College. Each of these has an able Faculty. Although a Homœopathist as we are, we cannot speak disrespectfully, or in the least detract from the high standing of our medical colleges of this city. The Professors, without an exception, are high-minded, honorable men. They understand their business, which is to teach, and they never inquire what a student intends to do with the knowledge he may acquire from them. They will give a *diploma* to the student of a Homœopath, if on examination he is found qualified, as soon as to one of their own. The New York Colleges have never manifested anything like intolerance, and we are sure they never will, for the spirit of our republican institutions will be forever a bar to such inconsistency.

Some of our readers may inquire, why do you speak thus of Allopathic colleges? The answer is, they teach thoroughly branches which are indispensable to every real physician, viz.: Anatomy and Physiology, Surgical Anatomy and Surgery, Midwifery, Chemistry, and the character of diseases, with their history. The only things we object to are their Therapeutics and their Materia Medica, both of which are of no practical value; and yet every student should know the allopathic mode of treating diseases, as a matter of history, if nothing more. Therefore we do not think it right to denounce, indiscriminately, the medical colleges of our city and country because two branches out of nine are rejected by the school of Homœopathy.

WHAT IS HOMŒOPATHY?

The following is from a pamphlet entitled "What is Homœopathy?" By W. SHARP, F.R.S., London.

5. Homœopathy is not a "*humbug*." Neither are those who profess it "knaves or fools, swindlers or donkeys." Were the matter a piece of deceit, it is not likely to have had the steady success which its opponents are constrained to acknowledge attends its practice. A short time, at any rate, would expose its fallacy. An ingenious and plausible advocate might make an *hypothesis* popular, but he could never obtain extensive belief in the statement of a supposed *fact* which every day's observation proved to be untrue. As to the hard names, they are no arguments, and therefore must remain unanswered, except by the observation that they generally betray a weak

cause on the side of those who use them; Men conscious of integrity can afford to despise them. We are forbidden, and feel no inclination to return railing for railing; what we wish is that our medical brethren would study our science, and instead of abusing *us*, help us to improve *it*, for the benefit of our own and of future generations. When any one speaks disrespectfully of things of which he is ignorant, he may be very fitly rebuked, as Dr. Halley was by Sir Isaac Newton:—"I have studied these things—you have not."

6. HOMŒOPATHY IS A GENERAL FACT,—*a principle,—a law of nature.* All nature is exquisitely arranged and governed by perfect laws,—the result of infinite wisdom and almighty power. The discovery of these general facts has marked epochs in the annals of mankind. What consequences have followed the discovery that a magnetised steel bar, when free to move horizontally, always turns one of its extremities towards the north pole of the earth? And what will follow from the further fact, so recently discovered by Ørsted, that when this bar is surrounded by a current of electricity, its direction is altered, at will, to the right hand or to the left, as is seen in the electric telegraph? Who attempts to *explain* or to *ridicule* these things? They are *FACTS*. Newton discovered that the force of gravity is in direct proportion to the mass of matter in the attracting bodies, and in inverse proportion to the square of their distances. Doubtless many other proportions are *possible*, but this is the one fixed upon by the wisdom of the Great God. Dalton discovered that the elements of matter, when combining chemically with each other, always do so in certain fixed proportions; for example, oxygen combines with hydrogen in the proportion of eight parts by weight to one. This is an interesting particular fact; but it becomes much more important when it is known to be a general fact that oxygen will combine in the same proportion of eight parts by weight with a fixed weight of every other element; as with six of carbon, sixteen of sulphur, fifteen of phosphorus, thirty-five of chlorine, twenty-seven of iron, thirty-one of copper, etc., and these likewise with each other in the same proportions in which they combine with oxygen; as thirty-five of chlorine with one of hydrogen, twenty-seven of iron, thirty-one of copper, etc., etc. Here is a law of nature, absolutely unalterable by us, and yet it is most evident that these proportions of combination *might* have been very different;—they are so arranged by infinite wisdom—we cannot explain why—*shall we ridicule the arrangement?* So we can imagine many laws of healing, but our business is to discover, if possible, the actual one. The evidence in favor of *similia similibus curantur* is already great, and is increasing daily. It claims to be received as a *general fact*, unless it can be set aside by good *evidence* to the contrary. Let it be borne in mind that ordinary

medicine is without a rule, and even, as contended for by the present President of the Royal College of Physicians, "incapable" of receiving one. It is, consequently, in the condition of ships before the discovery of the mariner's compass. If then a rule be found, how great must be its value! It is not possible to overrate the value of a well-founded principle in any branch of science, for "principles built upon the unerring foundation of observations and experiments must necessarily stand good till the dissolution of nature itself." (Emerson, in Newton's Principia, vol. iii. p. 86.)

7. Homœopathy is a practical fact. It is not a speculative theory to be reasoned upon in the closet, but a fact to be observed at the bedside; it is no metaphysical subject, to be logically shown by *à priori* reasoning to be absurd; it is no piece of presumption and impudence to be put down "by authority," as the Council of our Royal College of Surgeons happily acknowledges; it is a fact to be examined, like the statement of any other fact, upon evidence. We are not called upon to sit down and imagine its possibility or its impossibility, but we are urgently pressed to observe whether it be true or not. Hundreds of credible witnesses tell us that all curable diseases are, for the most part, readily cured by the new method. This is asserted as a fact. Is it true? This is the question. Try the medicines—why should you not? The interests of humanity require it. If they succeed, it is a great blessing; if they fail, publish the failures. This is the only fair and honest way to oppose homœopathy, and in no other way is it likely to be opposed with success.

8. Homœopathy stands upon its comparative merits. This must be the test of all methods of treating disease. There is no absolute preservation from suffering in a sinful world, nor any deliverance from death. "There is no discharge in that war." And as all generations have died under the old method, so, should the new one prevail, all generations will continue to die under it. This consideration should render disputants on both sides sober-minded. Medical men are engaged in an unequal contest—the great enemy will always conquer at last; but the question is a fair and rational one, from which class of means we do actually obtain the greatest amount of relief from bodily suffering, and by which is the apparent approach of death most frequently warded off? This reduces the whole matter to what would seem to be its proper shape—a practical question—what will do me most good when I am ill?

9. The old method is unsatisfactory. This is admitted by almost all medical authorities. It is not necessary to bring forward quotations in support of this statement, they might be had in abundance; but the fact is so notorious, that the differing of doctors has become a proverb; in short, there is no opposition of senti-

ment or of practice too great not to be frequently met with. I well remember the reply made to me by an eminent and old practitioner when I was a pupil, who saw the distress I was in on perceiving the uncertain condition of medical knowledge, "If there be nothing true in medicine, there is in surgery, so you must give your mind to *that*!" The old medicine is in the condition that astronomy was in before Newton, and in a worse condition than chemistry was in before Dalton; many valuable isolated facts known, but no golden thread, no law of nature discovered, by which a host of conflicting conjectures might be dissipated, and facts reduced to an intelligible order.

10. Homœopathy is simple and intelligible. However absurd the rule may appear to some, it is, practically, a plain one, and becomes, to those who follow it, more easy and more satisfactory every day. It is not pretended that it can be carried out without serious labor. The law of gravity is abundantly plain and simple, but there are plenty of difficulties, notwithstanding, in working out the inequalities of the moon's motions.

11. Homœopathy gains by comparison. It is more successful than the old system. This comparison can be instituted in two ways—by the statistics of public institutions, and by those converts from the old practice who have tried it long enough to be able to compare with each other the results, in their own hands, of the two methods. As an illustration of the former mode of comparison, the following abstract, drawn from Dr. Routh's statistics (in the "Fallacies of Homœopathy"), is given by his reviewer, "by which the relative success of the new and the old modes of treatment can be seen at a glance."

Homœopathic Treatment.	Deaths per cent.	Allopathic Treatment.	Deaths per cent.
Pneumonia	5·7		24·
Pleuritis	3·		13·
Peritonitis	4·		13·
Dysentery	3·		22·
All Diseases	4·4		8·5

When, in 1836, the Asiatic cholera attacked, as an awful scourge, the city of Vienna, all the hospitals were fitted up to receive cases indiscriminately, as they occurred; one was a homœopathic hospital, but under the inspection of two allopathic physicians. The authorised report, when the epidemic had done its work of death, was this:—

Mortality in the Homœopathic Hospital.	Mortality in the Allopathic Hospital.
Under 33 per cent.	66 per cent.

Two-thirds recovered in the one, and two-thirds died in the other. See the well-known book, "Austria and its Institutions," by Mr. W. R. Wilde, M.R.I.A.

The results of the treatment of Asiatic cholera in this country have been similarly successful. When it visited Liverpool, in 1849, it was of a virulent character. During the

week ending on the 18th of August, the number of deaths amounted to 572. The total number of deaths in Liverpool from cholera, from May 20th to October 6th, was 5,098. The population of the town at that time was 360,000. The mortality by cholera was therefore about 1.4 per cent. of the entire population. The mortality out of the cases of cholera was 46 per cent., as reported by Dr. Duncan, the medical officer of health: the mortality among those treated homœopathically was 25 per cent.

Many other statistics might be added, leading to the same conclusion. The second mode of comparison rests in the bosom of each private practitioner. Thus much, however, may be stated, so far as I am at present informed; every practitioner who has, with sufficient care and perseverance, studied homœopathy, has embraced it, and I have not yet heard of one who has deserted its ranks because he has been disappointed as to the efficacy and superiority of this mode of treatment. For myself I may be permitted to say that, having practiced the old method for many years with success, and having now devoted myself for some time to the new mode, while I at once acknowledge that the study is laborious, and not without its difficulties, I am persuaded that it is a change for the better, and I venture to engage that if my medical brethren will try such plants as the following, prepared as we now use them, in the cases for which they are indicated by the law of *similia*, they will be greatly surprised and gratified by their beneficial effects:—

Aconitum Napellus,	Atropa Belladonna,
Bryonia Alba,	Arnica Montana,
Matricaria Chamomilla,	Pulsatilla Pratensis,
Ipecacuanha,	Nux Vomica, etc., etc.

12. Homœopathy is medical treatment. It is not the do-nothing system which it is represented to be by opponents, who thus only betray their ignorance. When fever and dysentery were desolating many parts of Ireland in 1847, one of the places which suffered most was Bantry, near Skibereen, in the county of Cork. During ten weeks one hundred and ninety-two cases were treated homœopathically by Mr. Kidd, at their two homes, amid all the wretchedness of famine; the mortality from fever was less than two per cent., and from dysentery fourteen per cent. During the same period many were treated on the old method in the Bantry Union Hospital, with the advantages of proper ventilation, attendance, nourishment, etc., and from the report of Dr. Tuckey, the physician, the mortality from fever was more than thirteen per cent., and from dysentery, thirty-six per cent.

At the same time another Fever Hospital was opened for similar cases occurring among the emigrants from Ireland to this country, in which the medical man tells us he abstained from all interference, and remained passively watching the cases, order-

ing them free ventilation, cleanliness, and confinement to bed; water, or milk and water being given as drinks. He congratulates himself upon the success attendant upon thus allowing the cases to take their natural course, undisturbed by medicine; the deaths from fever in this hospital were ten per cent. We have here, therefore, an opportunity of comparing together the results of the three methods—the ordinary system of medicine, no medicine at all, and the homœopathic medicine. The deaths from fever are thus reported:—under ordinary medicine, above thirteen per cent.; under no medicine at all, ten per cent.; under homœopathic medicine, less than two per cent. A sufficient proof that *that* is doing something and gaining by it; while by the same comparison, giving large doses of medicine is doing something indeed, but losing by it.

13. Homœopathy is a practical guide. It is not, like hydropathy, a single remedy to be applied in the treatment of every disease; it is a guide or rule to direct us in the use of all remedies. The medical practitioner who for years has felt and mourned over the bewildered condition of his professional knowledge, the contradictions of his theories, and the uncertainty of his facts, is the only person who can fully appreciate the value of any principle capable of affording him a light to guide his path. Few intelligent persons, however, can have failed to discover, from their intercourse with physicians, that ordinary medicine is in an unsettled and benighted condition. It has many valuable facts, it has many excellent remedies; but the facts are isolated, or connected only by false hypotheses, and the remedies are made use of in such a vague manner, and in such destructive doses, that the value of the one and the excellence of the other are either greatly impaired or converted into injuries.

14. Homœopathy is a guide in the choice of the medicine, not of the dose. The dose is, as yet, a question of experience. The law of *similia* is an admirable guide in the selection of an appropriate remedy in any case of disease; but the only information it affords in the choice of the dose is this, that it must be a *smaller* one than would be sufficient to produce similar symptoms in health. *How small* a dose this is must be ascertained by trial, until some general fact or law can happily be discovered which will constitute a guide to the dose, as the law of *similia* does to the medicine. I venture to entertain a sanguine hope that this will be accomplished.

15. Homœopathy aims at eradicating, or permanently curing the disease, wherever this is possible, not merely at affording palliative relief. This constitutes another great feature of the new method, and again points out, in a striking manner, its superiority over the old mode. If the symptoms of an ailment are cured by the operation of the remedy upon the constitution, the cause of those

symptoms, or the pathological condition, is, in all probability, permanently removed. In seeking to effect this, no other mischief is occasioned. How often has not this case occurred: a patient is suffering from cough, medicines called expectorants are prescribed. At the next visit the cough is somewhat relieved, but the expectorants have unfortunately produced nausea, and the appetite is gone: mineral acids are ordered to improve the tone of the stomach, and to restore appetite. At the following visit the appetite is better, but the acid has irritated the mucous membrane of the bowels, and has produced diarrhœa; to check this astringents must be given, which have occasioned, by the time of the next visit, a return or aggravation of the cough, and thus the round has to be recommenced. Who does not see that there is room for improvement in such a system? But the greatest of all difficulties of the old mode of treatment is this,—to decide the point whether depleting and lowering measures, antiphlogistics, as they are called, are indicated, or the opposite remedies, stimulants and tonics. The most eminent and experienced practitioners not unfrequently differ in their opinions upon this important point, even when humanly speaking, the life of the patient hangs upon the decision. Now this acknowledged and grave difficulty is greatly mitigated, if not entirely removed, under the new method; the group of symptoms has to be taken, and a similar group found belonging to any remedy;—*that* is the remedy most likely to be useful, by whatever name it has been usual to designate it.

16. Homœopathy *economises the vital powers*. It does not, like bleeding, and purging, and salivating, and sweating, draw largely upon the remaining strength of the patient, already perhaps greatly reduced by his sufferings. Homœopathy lets well alone. Its medicines act only on the diseased organ. If the head be sick, it does not add to this sickness a complaint in the intestines, which strong purgatives must do; if the lungs be inflamed, it does not also bring on an inflammation in the skin, which a blister does. The beneficial consequence of this method is conspicuous in the speedy return of the patient to his accustomed health and occupation. When the acute disease is removed, which it often is in an unusually short space of time, the patient is well; he has no tedious convalescence, requiring wine and bark.

17. Homœopathy *is gentle and agreeable*. If the new mode of treatment be found on trial to be *only as efficacious* as the old one, it ought to be preferred on account of its gentleness and pleasantness; how much more if it succeed *better*. The action of the medicines, in point of fact, is found to be such as to supersede the necessity for the severe measures and nauseous doses hitherto had recourse to. The medicines are tasteless, or nearly so, themselves, and they do not need

the aid of such formidable adjuncts, as bleeding, and blistering, and setons, and issues, and cauterizations, and moxas. Already, indeed, the beneficial influence of homœopathy in this respect upon general practice has been generally felt. In the year 1827, I attended the hospital in Paris, which was in charge of Baron Larrey, Senior Surgeon to the Army of Napoleon. At every morning's visit, he had, among his numerous attendants, two "internes," or dressers, as they are called at the London hospitals, accoutered in this manner:—one carried a small chafing-dish with fire in it, the other a box, containing a number of actual cauteries (irons like small pokers), and a pair of bellows. As we passed from bed to bed, one or more of the suffering occupants was sure to be ordered to the cautery, when one of the irons was immediately placed in the chafing-dish, the bellows were applied, and as soon as the instrument was brilliantly red hot, the Baron would take it in his hand, and deliberately draw two or three lines on the flesh of the patient, very like the marks with which most of us are familiar, made by the ordnance surveyors on our houses and pavements, during their labors in all parts of the country. Now, surely, to see banished forever, not only such painful methods as this, but everything which approaches to it, must be a summation to be wished for.

18. Homœopathy *administers one medicine at a time*. This is another great improvement. How was it possible ever to attain to a satisfactory knowledge of the powers and properties of any drug, so long as several were always combined together when given to a patient? In the days of Sydenham, the father of English medicine, sixty or eighty medicines were mixed together in the favorite prescriptions; this number has been greatly reduced since the time of Sydenham, but so long as only two medicines are given together, it is impossible to ascertain with accuracy the effects of either.

19. The Homœopathic physician *learns the properties of drugs by experiments upon himself, not upon his patients*. That the contrary has been the plan hitherto adopted, is notorious. How many poor people have been deterred from availing themselves of the aid of our hospitals, lest they should have "experiences" tried upon them!

The only certain way of learning the effects of drugs upon man's health, is to administer them experimentally to *healthy* persons. None have thought of this method, so far as appears, except the illustrious Haller and Hahnemann;—none have attempted to carry it out except Hahnemann and his disciples.

It is evident that the properties of medicinal substances must be ascertained by some kind of experiment; the question in dispute is this,—is it best to try those experiments upon sick persons, or upon healthy ones? Shall the physician get his knowledge by ex-

perimenting upon his patients or upon himself? The practitioners of the old school pursue the former method, those of the new one the latter. What does the patient say?

20. Homœopathy is applicable to acute as well as to chronic diseases. When the discovery was first announced to the world by Hahnemann, he did not carry its application further than to chronic diseases,—to ailments continuing for a long time. And the impression is still general that such treatment may possibly avail where there is abundance of time, but what is to be done in cases of emergency? Acute disease with immediate danger,—how can you trust to homœopathy then? The answer to this grave question which manifold experience gives, as indeed may be partly gathered from the statistics of cholera and other acute diseases, given in the preceding pages, is this,—that it is able to grapple with the most dangerous and sudden attacks of disease more successfully than any other known method of treatment.

21. Homœopathy is prepared for any new form of disease far better than the old method. This fact was very strikingly exhibited on the appearance of Asiatic cholera in Europe. The various Colleges of Physicians were quite at a loss to know how to deal with the formidable stranger; and when called upon, in their respective countries, to issue advice and directions, nothing could be more painful than the visible inconsistencies and unsatisfactoriness of their multiform recommendations.

On the other hand, the homœopathic practitioners, whether in Russia or in Austria, in France or in England, found the true remedies without co-operation and without difficulty, and they proved wonderfully successful. Hahnemann himself published a tract pointing out the proper treatment, from the description he had read of the disease before he had seen a case.

This point was with Sydenham a great source of perplexity. "This, at least," says he, "I am convinced of, viz., that epidemic diseases differ from one another like north and south, and that the remedy which would cure a patient at the beginning of a year, will kill him perhaps at the close. Again, that when once by good fortune I have hit upon the true and proper line of practice that this or that fever requires, I can (with the assistance of the Almighty), by taking my aim in the same direction, generally succeed in my results. This lasts until the first form of epidemic becomes extinct, and until a fresh one sets in. Then I am again in a quandary, and am puzzled to think how I can give relief. . . . It is more than I can do to avoid risking the lives of one or two of the first who apply to me as patients."* This is the confession of a man entitled, for his truthfulness and his genius, to the high-

est admiration. The difficulty, though not perhaps always so frankly acknowledged, has been always felt until now; it is not a difficulty in homœopathy.

22. Homœopathy carries into detail what all medicine is in the general. Medicines are not food, but poisons; not materials which of themselves can preserve or produce health. They are all naturally inimical to the human body, but when that body is in a state of disease, they are found, as a matter of experience, sometimes to assist in restoring it to health.

Medicine, in the general, is poison to the healthy frame of man, and a remedy to that frame when sick; this is admitted by all, and this is homœopathy in the general; why not then have homœopathy in detail? Why not first ascertain what symptoms each poison produces, when taken in health, and why not give it as a remedy for similar symptoms in natural disease? Medical men have been experimenting in the treatment of disease for many centuries, why not try this experiment? Our opponents admit in general what they ridicule and oppose when carried out in particulars.

23. Finally, homœopathy relates only to the administration of remedies, and detracts nothing from the value of the collateral branches of the science of medicine. It leaves anatomy, physiology, chemistry, etc., unaffected. The homœopathic physician ought to be as accomplished in this and other departments of knowledge as his fellow-practitioner of the old school; and he is more likely than the other to turn all such knowledge to the beneficial account of his patient.

PERIODICALS RECEIVED.

The North-Western Journal of Homœopathia for April, May and June, in one number.

Quarterly Homœopathic Journal, edited by Drs. J. Birnstill and J. A. Tarbell, and published by Otis Clapp, Boston. The editors say, "After an intermission of eighteen months, the 'Quarterly' again makes its appearance. Although reduced in size, we trust it will not be found so in spirit." The subscription price is one dollar a year.

The Philadelphia Journal of Homœopathy, for August, 1852. A valuable number.

The American Magazine, devoted to Homœopathy and Hydropathy, for August, 1852.

The Michigan Journal of Homœopathy.

* Works of Sydenham, vol. i. p. 33, Sydenham Society's edition.

HOMŒOPATHIST *versus* ALLOPATHIST.

To the Editor of the Homœopathic Times.

SIR :—Perhaps my subject, and the inexperience which must be evident in my treatment of it, will preclude the possibility of its appearance in your columns; nevertheless what seems to me to be a duty towards those participators in our opinions who are in any way likely to be intimidated by the invectives so liberally poured forth by our antagonists—who, it must be confessed, are greatly to be pitied, considering the rapid increase of the popularity and adoption of our system—shall be performed.

I am personally acquainted with many unfortunate individuals who have rejected homœopathy when on the point of its adoption, because their medical friend (or, till worse, adviser) has terrified their imaginations with fearful stories of patients lost, or starved, or poisoned under its treatment; some asserting our medicines to be virulent poisons, others that they are no medicines at all, and midst these contradictory statements the terrified patient remains under the tender care of his licensed annihilator, till, when all human aid is of no avail, a homœopathic physician is applied to, and in a few days or weeks the death of the unlucky patient adds, *of course*, one more decisive proof to the inefficacy of our devoted system.

There is another fashionable fallacy to which I would call the attention of the inexperienced. I have often heard the remark, "But, surely, medical men must have the best means of judging of the effects of this and every other medical system." And permit me to say, this holds true, if self-interest is the best pair of spectacles a man can wear to discern clearly the merits of a cause decidedly opposed to that instinct; but I will ask those who hold this opinion, whether the merits of law reform would receive a due appreciation from an attorney, or if a regulation of the church revenues (of which we have of late heard so much) would be wisely intrusted to a bishop. Now I think the simple deduction from this "rule of two" will be, that an allopathic practitioner is not the most fit person of all others to judge of the merits of our system. I would also observe, that my experience has invariably shown me that those professional members of the old system to whom their practice is of no pecuniary importance, or has retired from them or they from it, are never decidedly opposed

to the doctrine or the disciples of the man who will at some future period be universally acknowledged as the medical benefactor of his race. Meanwhile, why cannot our persecutors follow the charitable counsel of Gamaliel? fully persuaded, as they are, that if our system is what they believe it to be—a pitiful deception, a mockery habited in the garb of science—it will, it *must* fall; it must decrease. The public mind, though it may not be, nor is it, well stored with medical *learning*, as are these worthy gentlemen, is still not so devoid of common sense and common perception as to be long deceived by a shadow, by a nothing wearing the *show* of reality. But if, as we know, it is far otherwise, let them remember that little indeed can envy, hatred, and malice do to retard the progress of a great truth; and let us ever remember that when reason fails, ridicule and calumny are the broken reeds resorted to; they are, as it were, the last death-struggle of an expiring cause, the last flickering of a decaying light, flaring with increased brilliancy immediately previous to its fatal extinction.

My advice is that we be neither importunate nor uncharitable towards those who will some day find it convenient to change their opinions. We can *afford* to be otherwise; we have on our side what none can take from us—*truth*. Let us then willingly and cheerfully leave to them the enjoyment of that ridicule and satire so freely bestowed on us, and in charity attribute the unhealthy susceptibility of their minds to the poisonous *effluvia* of their own laboratories, proving, by our own dignified reserve, that homœopathy is as beneficial to the moral as to the physical condition of mankind.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A LAY HOMŒOPATH.

The North American Homœopathic Journal and the Homœopathist do not reach this office. The latter we have not seen for six months. Where is it?

The committee who have in charge the establishment of a Homœopathic Hospital in this city, are zealously engaged in their duties, and we understand that the prospect is good for a speedy organization of such an institution. The committee have prepared an address to the public and the friends of Homœopathy, which we received too late for notice.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1852.

NO. 5.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

NORTHERN HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

(From the Huddersfield Chronicle.)

THE third meeting of this Association was held at Dr. Ramsbotham's, in this town, on the 2d inst., when there were present Drs. Drysdale, Liverpool; Irvine, Leeds; Craig, Leeds; Ransford, York; Ramsbotham and Cameron, Huddersfield; Wright, Halifax; Tuckey, Preston; Norton, Chester; and Atkin, Hull; Messrs. Phillips, Manchester; Scholefield, Bolton; Booth, Leeds; Holland, Rochdale; Moore, Liverpool; Brady, Huddersfield; and Smith, Sheffield. Visitors—Stirling Howard, Esq., and C. Dickson, Esq., Sheffield; Messrs. Turner, Manchester; and Haycock, Huddersfield. Mr. Phillips, the late president, having taken the chair, Dr. Ramsbotham was unanimously elected president, and took the chair. The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. Applications from two gentlemen desirous of becoming members of the Association were read and referred to the next meeting.

The secretary presented an abstract of Dr. Craig's proving of *Cotyledon Umbilicus*.

Dr. Irvine made a communication on mesmerism, illustrated with experiments, for which the thanks of the Association were given by the president.

The next meeting was fixed to be held in Manchester, on the second week in January, and Mr. Phillips was appointed local secretary. The Association then adjourned.

At six o'clock nearly one hundred members and friends sat down to a most sumptuous dinner, provided with great liberality by Mr. and Mrs. Reid, of the Rose and Crown Hotel. The dinner was served up in the recently-erected Masonic Hall attached to the house, which was tastefully decorated with evergreens for the occasion. James Stansfield, Esq., of Halifax, presided, and was supported on his right and left by the Rev. R. Collins, vicar of Kirkburton; the Rev. A. H. Frost, incumbent of Meltham Mills; the Rev. D. Meredith, incumbent of Elland; and the Rev. Mr. Hutchinson. The vice-chair was occupied by Dr. Ramsbotham, and, in addition to the gentlemen present at the morning meeting, we observed among the company, Messrs.

Sydney Morehouse, Joseph Norton, Thomas Varley, W. Barker, E. Eastwood, Jos. Shaw, H. B. Taylor, S. Howell, John Whitacre, Charles Dixon, H. Huntriss, J. Labrey, R. Jackson, S. Routledge, J. Hannah, W. Moore, W. Hardy, and others. A party of amateur glee-singers, accompanied by Mr. J. Wood on the piano, were present, and contributed very agreeably to the pleasures of the evening.

On the cloth being withdrawn, and the dessert placed on the table,

The Chairman gave "the Queen," and "Prince Albert, and the Royal Family," which were drunk with the honors, followed by the National Anthem.

Dr. Ramsbotham then read a number of letters from clergymen and other gentlemen, expressive of their regret at being unable to be present, but wishing every success to homœopathy. The several communications having been read,

The VICE-CHAIRMAN again rose to give the toast, "The Memory of Hahnemann." He observed that he could, with great truth and sincerity, say that this was one of the happiest days of his life. If anybody had told him four or five years ago that within such a period he should have been seated at the bottom of a table surrounded by so many supporters and friends of homœopathy, he could not have believed it. (Hear.) He felt that this day was a day of great solemnity to those who, like himself, had launched themselves in the bark of homœopathy. It was the anniversary of the death of their great master, and he was sure they would feel that a festival was no inappropriate thing even on the anniversary of his death. (Hear, hear.) For if it was true that a good name was better than precious ointment, and the day of one's death than the day of one's birth, it was never more so than in the case of Dr. Hahnemann. He was quite convinced that from the time of Æsculapius or Hippocrates to the present, there had never shone such a light in medicine as the illustrious Hahnemann. What was medicine before his time? It was a mass, no doubt, of valuable facts and learning, but of misapplied knowledge. (Hear.) Great men had arisen—great discoveries had been made—but there had never been a law of healing—a universal law applicable to all cases, by which a man could

be guided in his treatment of disease. (Hear.) They were accused by their opponents of casting behind their backs the facts and accumulated knowledge of ages. They did no such thing. They accepted everything that was valuable in the old school of medicine; they read their works and were taught in their schools, but what Hahnemann had done was to give them a law which enabled them to arrange these facts and accumulations of experience, so that they could find a remedy for all curable diseases. (Hear.) He was a sincere convert to the doctrine of Hahnemann, and by this doctrine he was determined to stand or fall. (Applause.) He should like to tell them what Homœopathy was. It was not in itself a system of small doses, but was a law of nature discovered by Hahnemann, expressed in the words, *like cures like*. He found that medicines, which have been known for ages as *specifics*, have the power of producing symptoms similar to those of the diseases which they cure. Struck with this fact, he proceeded in a course of long-continued and painful experiments on his own person and on those of his family and friends, whom he could induce to take the drugs, to ascertain their effects or symptoms on healthy bodies. He then went on to try the medicines in natural diseases, the symptoms of which were like those produced by the drugs on healthy persons; he was successful in curing the diseases, but found that the ordinary dose in most cases caused painful aggravations before the cure was effected. This led him to reduce the dose, and hence arose that practice of infinitesimal doses which had been the stumbling-block of the profession. Homœopaths, therefore, believed that medicines cure diseases, not by disturbing the healthy parts of the body, but by acting simply on those that are suffering in a manner similar to the disease itself. Take as an illustration a case of vomiting. There were few of them who had arrived at the age of manhood but had experienced this affection, or taken emetics. The most common emetic was Ipecacuanha. Twenty grains were sufficient to make a man vomit, and if any number of people were to take it, they would all be more or less affected with sickness. The law of healing says that we must apply such remedies as produced similar effects to the disease itself, and, therefore, if a person was found suffering from sickness, not caused by the medicine, the remedy would be Ipecacuanha; but every one would see that if under such circumstances twenty grains were given, matters would be made much worse. Such would be the fact, and therefore they gave a smaller dose—but the quantity was a matter of experience. *The small dose* was not Homœopathy, but it was the application of *like to like*. They were guided by the law laid down by Hahnemann, that *like cures like*—not as their opponents, the *Medical Times* and the *Lancet*, said—the *same to the same*—so that a drowning man must be drowned a little more, and a man who

had been hung, hanged a little more. That was not Homœopathy. (Hear.) Homœopathy gave *like to like*, but they must give it in minute doses, or they would make bad worse. The smallness of the dose was the consequence of the application of the law, but not the law itself. The quantity to be given was not settled, and whether one professional man gave decimal tinctures, and another centesimal tinctures, and a third globules, all were equally homœopaths. (Hear.) Unfortunately these infinitesimal doses had been laid hold of, and much ridicule and vituperation cast upon them by those who had not investigated the science. A Dr. Simmons had published a lecture delivered by him at the Chatham street School of Medicine, Manchester, in which he stated that there had recently sprung up a dangerous and pernicious sect (homœopaths), whose object was not the advancement of science, but who sought to ignore the experience of the past. Now, he (Dr. Ramsbotham) had already told them that homœopaths did not reject the accumulated wisdom of ages; and as to the charge of being “the knaves, the pariahs, and the prostitutes of a noble profession,” it was fully answered by the meeting which he saw before him. They were not knaves, etc.; their characters had been before the world long prior to their conversion to Homœopathy. Dr. Ramsbotham then read extracts from the works of Sydenham (the English Hippocrates), from Van Helmont, Silvius, and others, to show that the allopaths rejected much of the accumulated experience of ages. In his “*Processus Integri, or Practice of Physic*,” Sydenham said:—“Pleurisy consists of a preternatural fermentation of the blood extravasated; in which fermentation, the sharp particles do by their points or acrimony vellicate the membraceous parts, and being intimately fixed in the nervous fibres, they make a concussion therein, which because it is continued to the origination of the nerves, a sad sensation of pain does arise, which is various, dull, pungent, rending, throbbing, distending, corroding, etc., according to the nature of the part affected, quality of the spirits, and concurrent particles of the blood and humours.” In regard to its treatment, Sydenham went on to say on the next page:—“Bleed on the affected side three or four times, and take away ten ounces of blood. The juice expressed out of *horse-dung*, with water drawn from *ox, calves, sheep, or hog's blood*, is commended as an excellent thing, because it imbibes the pleuritic acid.” Helmont rejected bleeding “as an accursed remedy; because a pleurisy cured by bleeding often leaves a consumption behind it, and that they who use bleeding much do often fall into this disease: he commends powder of *stag's tail*, which may be drank to a drachm at a time, and also *goat's blood* taken liquid, and warm, or dried and given in powder to a drachm or more. Powder of *bull's tail* is also good, and of a *boar's tooth*. Or take *powder of goat's blood and of stag's tail*, of

each one scruple; red poppy water, an ounce and a half, mix for a dose. Or take flowers of red poppies and of daisies, leaves of wild chicory, of each a handful; horse-dung, an ounce and a half, boiled in barley-water; a sufficient quantity, strain and sweeten with syrup of red poppies, of which let the sick take a draught now and then." (Laughter.) What enlightened allopath would now acknowledge either the theory or the treatment he had read? Alterations and improvements in the practice of medicine had taken place from time to time. Why then, he asked, not go a step further, and investigate facts which they could not gainsay? why not test the science according to the law, and if they found it true, receive it thankfully, as he had done? Homœopaths were not afraid of exposure. Homœopathy was not quackery. Quackery hid itself in secret places. From the time he had become convinced of the soundness of the principles of Hahnemann, he had called upon his brethren to look into the subject for themselves. Homœopathy courted investigation, and they would be glad to introduce it into their hospitals and infirmaries—to walk side by side with their brethren of the old school, so that the poor might choose that in which they had the most confidence. (Hear.) But this was not permitted, and they were cast out and repudiated as brethren. If, however, the friends of Homœopathy chose at any time to establish other institutions, he was sure that Dr. Wright, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Brady, and himself, would be most happy to devote their time to their management. Whether they did this or not, their brethren of the old school must either investigate Homœopathy or allow it to be practiced in their infirmaries, or otherwise confess that they dare not face the light. (Hear.) He could not say that if the governors of the Huddersfield or Halifax Infirmaries would, by a vote, permit the practice of Homœopathy in those institutions, they (the homœopaths) would so comport themselves that the other medical officers should at no time have any ground of complaint. But if they were not admitted, and the friends of Homœopathy chose to establish separate institutions, upon the heads of their opponents be the blame. They had offered their services, and were prepared to work amicably alongside of their professional brethren of the old school, without interfering with their practice; but if these offers were rejected and rival institutions should rise up, and if in the course of time the existing institutions should languish for want of support, again, he said, upon the heads of their opponents be the blame. (Hear, hear.) He appealed to facts, which, though again and again denied, had never been disproved. They had been charged by Dr. Routh with picking and choosing their cases, and with cooking their statistics, but he appealed to the experience of those before him whether this charge was true. (Hear, hear.) The results of the practice of Homœopathy in cases of Asiatic

cholera, in Huddersfield, were well known. Their statistics had been denied, and an endeavor had been made to upset them; and here, perhaps, they would pardon him for digressing a little from his subject. Far be it from him to cast one single reflection on the memory of those who were passed from amongst them. It was a somewhat singular circumstance that their meeting should take place this day, when one, much esteemed, and standing extremely and, he doubted not, deservedly high in the estimation of his friends, had been carried to his last resting place. He should be extremely sorry to be guilty of anything like reflecting on his memory, but truth was truth and must be spoken. He was there on the defensive in that which concerned him very nearly—the truth of the statistics which had been published in reference to the treatment of Asiatic cholera in this town. An endeavor had been made to upset those statistics, but no man had come forward with evidence to disprove a single fact. The application of Homœopathy was extremely successful in those cases. He rejoiced in it, because he was persuaded that the same success would at all times attend the efforts of all who rightly applied the law of *similia similibus curantur*. Before sitting down he must say a few words about Hahnemann himself. It was nine years ago that day since Hahnemann, full of years and of honors, ceased to live. He died on the 2d of July, 1843, in the 89th year of his age. Long before his great discovery, he was known as one of the most learned physicians of his age. It was in 1790, whilst translating Cullen's "Materia Medica," that the first ray of homœopathic light beamed into his mind. He then commenced that course of patient investigation which only ended with his life. In 1796 he communicated his discovery in a letter published in Hufeland's celebrated *Journal*. In 1806 he published his "Medicine founded on Experience," and in 1810 he gave to the world the first edition of his immortal work, the "Organon of the Healing Art." In 1821 his "Materia Medica," in six volumes, was completed, and in 1830 his "Chronic Diseases," in five volumes. These works contained the provings of a great number of medicines on persons in health, and were an invaluable guide in the choice of remedies in natural disease. At the time of his death he left a great treasury of facts in manuscript, which he (Dr. Ramsbotham) trusted would one day in their integrity become the property of his disciples. The promulgation of his discovery brought down on Hahnemann a storm of untiring persecution. The apothecaries brought forward some obsolete law, by which physicians were not permitted in Germany to prepare their own medicines. It was impossible for Hahnemann to submit the delicate preparation of his medicines to his avowed enemies; he was, therefore, driven from city to city, until in 1820 he was invited by the enlightened sovereign of Anhalt-Coethen to

accept an asylum in his dominions. Here he resided until he went to Paris, in 1835, where he lived, sought and followed by the highest in rank and science, and received the full acknowledgement of his merits. The seven years he lived in Paris were passed in almost uninterrupted happiness. He left his disciples a science so near perfection, that it was a great source of satisfaction to them that not one of those who had adopted the system had been disappointed: and when he (Dr. Ramsbotham) looked at America, England, and the continent of Europe, and found that there were 3,000 homœopathic practitioners—gentlemen who had been educated in the same schools as their brethren, and received the same diplomas,—he could not but feel that the day of Hahnemann's death was better than his birth, and that the memory of his name was better than precious ointment. (Hear, hear.) Let them drink, then, in solemn silence, to the memory of their great master, and be glad that such a light had been permitted by the Almighty to shine upon them. (Applause.)

The Rev. R. COLLINS rose and said, he had been requested to propose a toast which he was sure would meet with the cordial approbation of all present. Homœopathy, he might observe, must stand or fall by facts, and he thought the facts so numerous and well attested, that it would be a very difficult thing to overturn them. These facts were accumulating daily, and in the full persuasion that in proportion as Homœopathy was tested these facts would become more numerous, he rejoiced that they were there that day. There were three advantages which homœopathic medicine possessed. In the first place, it was a very pleasant kind of medicine, and never caused any wry faces; second, it was a very expeditious mode of treatment; and in the last place, it was an effectual mode of treatment. (Hear.) He believed it would go on prospering, and in conclusion he had great pleasure in proposing "Success to the Northern Homœopathic Association." (Applause.)

The toast was drunk with honors.

Dr. ATKIN acknowledged the toast, and said, that the reason why they had established this Association was simple and cogent. The practitioners of Homœopathy were few and scattered, and they felt that their isolated position prevented them from enjoying that support of their colleagues, and of conversing and consulting with them on professional matters, which was desirable. The Institution had been established in the early part of the present year, and had been most successful. He thanked them for their presence that evening, indicating as it did the interest they felt in the movement, and he was sure that they would each return to their respective homes more determined than ever to make still further exertions towards advancing the science of Homœopathy, and in that way the best interests of their patients. (Hear.) He again

thanked them in the name of his colleagues for the kind manner in which they had given this toast. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN, in calling upon the next speaker, said he trusted the time was not far distant when homœopathic practitioners would be permitted to practice in the infirmaries of Huddersfield and Halifax, or else in institutions of their own. He trusted, in unison if it could be done, but if not in unison, then in institutions of their own. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. RANSFORD, of York, in proposing "Success to Homœopathic Hospitals and Dispensaries," said he could not boast of much experience in such institutions, but at the same time he felt it his duty, whenever one was erected in the city where he might be residing, to give it his hearty support. The Institution at York was in such an infant state that he could not refer to it as an illustration of success, but he might say that the result hitherto was most encouraging. (Hear, hear.) He was delighted to be surrounded by so many friends of Homœopathy, and he was sure they would return home encouraged to pursue their practice with increased energy. He knew well the resources of Allopathy, having practiced it for many years, and had often trembled at the danger in which it involved him; but now he stood on better ground, and he would say that if their enemies could show them a still better path, they would immediately adopt it, as their object was simply to benefit their patients. Those alone knew the value of Homœopathy who had tested it under trying circumstances, and for himself he must say that it had surpassed his most sanguine expectations. (Applause.) He had great pleasure in proposing the toast intrusted to him.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN then gave "The Health of the Chairman" which was received with cheers. In giving this toast he could not forbear mentioning one little fact that was interesting, but pre-eminently so to himself. It was to the brother of their most worthy chairman that he was indebted for the first ray of light which broke upon his mind in reference to this subject. He was travelling to London from Leeds some six years ago, when he met with Mr. Hatton Stansfeld. That gentleman kept him awake the whole night by relating fact upon fact, illustrative of the success of Homœopathy, until the subject forced itself upon his mind, and made him think that there might be something in that which he had so long despised. From that time he gave the science his consideration, and became a convert. (Hear, hear.) He had great pleasure in proposing the health of their excellent chairman. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN, in responding to the toast, said he felt deeply his inadequacy to do justice to the great and important cause they had met to advocate. He had felt some diffidence on this ground in acceding to the invitation to preside on this occasion; but, on the other hand, he should have been ungrateful to have

refused, knowing the benefit which he, in common with many others, had derived from this system. (Hear, hear.) There were two or three circumstances which, in the first instance, led him to think favorably of Homœopathy. There was the indisputable evidence of facts which he could not gainsay, accompanied with the opportunity of seeing results produced which could not be produced by any other science. These things impelled him to inquiry, and having made that small progress, he could not read without being further convinced of its truth. (Hear.) The statistical details referred to had not been cooked—they were too numerous and too severely criticised to be cooked. (Hear, hear.) Without referring to Asiatic cholera, he would allude to the effects of homœopathic treatment in Ireland during the prevalence of the famine fever in that country. The relative proportion of deaths under the two modes of treatment was, Homœopathy two, Allopathy thirteen. It was said that Homœopathy did nothing, and that the result was the effect of nature. The experiment had been tried on Irish emigrants, and the result gave the relative proportion as Homœopathy two, no medicine and left to nature ten—(laughter) a still more convincing proof to his mind of its efficiency. (Hear, hear.) He was fully persuaded that it was as much entitled to be called a science as any other branch of philosophy—a term to which he was bound to say the old system had no claim. There was a vast amount of facts and of valuable information collected in Allopathy, but they were isolated and never could be connected with the system; there was no fact which, when established, necessarily led to another; whilst homœopathic medicine was really a science—every step was a step in advance, and added to the grand fabric which was rising, and which, in time, would envelope the whole science of medicine. (Hear, hear.) Last of all there was the result of personal experience. Three and a half years ago he was afflicted with the gout, when he was homœopathically, and successfully, treated, and he was thankful to say he had never since had the slightest return of the symptoms. (Hear, hear.) Prior to that period he had effected an insurance upon his life. Up to that time he had received regular notice when the premium upon his policy was due, but on that occasion he did not do so, and the time when he should have paid unfortunately passed by. The circumstance of having the gout, however, reminded him of it, and he immediately wrote to the head office, expressing his surprise that no communication had been made to him as usual, giving at the same time a statement of his health and stating his willingness to pay any fine which might be demanded. He accordingly underwent a medical examination, which being unsatisfactory, he went to the fountain-head, and was examined by two or three leading physicians in London—amongst others by Dr. Paris, the

president of the Royal College of Physicians. That gentleman treated him in a very supercilious manner, laughed at his treatment, and the result was that the Society refused to re-insure him. (Expressions of disapprobation.) After, however, very great pressure, they consented to return him half the policy he had paid in. He had, therefore, very good cause for remembering his homœopathic treatment. He was grateful, however, to the bridge which had carried him over, and he could not but mark the conduct of those who had treated him in this way. He felt that the making known of facts would tend to the promotion and dissemination of a knowledge of that system which had freed so many from the narrow prejudices to which professional gentlemen of the old school were exposed. (Hear, hear.) He concluded by again expressing his approval of Homœopathy, and by acknowledging the manner in which his health had been drunk.

Dr. Norton briefly proposed "The Health of the Ladies," which was duly honored.

Dr. F. R. LEES said they had done him the honor of appointing him to propose the last toast, and it was one in which he was sure all present would heartily join. They were better aware than himself of the obligations under which their common cause lay to their vice-chairman. (Hear, hear.) He had not only advocated Homœopathy, but risked much public opprobrium in practising their principles. (Hear, hear.) With regard to his own views on this great question, he could only say that he concurred in the remarks previously made, that the foundation of the system was that of facts—and the broader their foundation of facts, the greater their triumph. They might sometimes be at a loss to account for facts—they might be in want of a theory, but whilst human theories were changing from day to day, the great facts of God would endure for ever. (Applause.) It had been said by one of the gentlemen present that Homœopathy was one of the greatest blessings to humanity—and so it was. With what was Jenner's name associated but with Homœopathy—the application of that which realised a similar disease to prevent its recurrence in a more virulent form? And what was the result?—the mitigation and almost annihilation of one of the greatest scourges to humanity. (Hear, hear.) They would not fail, as homœopathic practitioners became more numerous, to strike at the very fountain of disease, and promote the cause of human happiness. (Hear.) Hahnemann did not live to see the triumph of his discovery, but his shade should yet look down upon the successful progress of the truth with which his name was associated. (Hear, hear.) They might not live to see it, but their children would. (Applause.)

The toast was drank with cheers.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN, in responding to the toast, said he wished he could express in burn-

ing words of eloquence, such as they had just listened to, his feelings on this occasion. He did feel that the triumph of this great, this noble, this blessed Cause was secure; he felt that another generation would wonder when they heard and read how their forefathers had been treated during illness. It was but a short time since that he stood alone in Huddersfield, the laughing-stock of the town. If in any company conversation flagged, they needed but to mention his name or introduce the subject of Homœopathy to set it agoing again. Then, everybody had a tale to tell of this half-cracked individual. (Laughter.) He rejoiced that these days were gone, and that whatever his faults might be, upon this subject he was free from selfishness. He had been railed against and misrepresented by his medical brethren, but notwithstanding these things, he would offer them the right hand of fellowship, saying, "Come with us, and we will do you and your patients good." (Hear, hear.) This was not vain boasting, for they well knew the success of Homœopathy in Huddersfield, Halifax, Leeds, Hull, and Sheffield. It had been planted in those places successfully, and he was confident it would everywhere prevail. (Hear.) He thanked them for the toast they had just drunk. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN, accompanied by several other gentlemen, then retired, the vice-chairman and a large portion of the company remaining to a later hour.

After the retirement of the chairman and other friends,

Dr. RAMSBOTHAM proposed the health of Mr. Moore, in connection with the lay supporters of Homœopathy, to which Mr. Moore responded in an able speech, and before sitting down took occasion to propose the health of Mr. Brady, which was drunk with acclamation.

Mr. BRADY briefly returned thanks.

The health of Dr. Cameron was next proposed, in his absence, by Mr. Phillips, and in the course of his address Mr. Phillips paid a handsome tribute to Dr. Cameron's scholarship and general abilities.

The company was afterwards addressed by Mr. Edmund Eastwood, Mr. C. Dixon, of Sheffield, and Mr. James Brook; after which the party soon separated, all highly gratified and evidently deeply interested by the proceedings of the evening.

WORDS TO THE WISE.

"There is a sublime morality which tells us that the triumph of an opinion must be purchased by the sacrifices of the person; that patriotism is not party; that good deeds belong to all time, but not always in the greatest degree to the age which reaps their first benefit; that all policy, even the most beneficial, does its measure of wrong, which must be atoned or in the person of the author; that patriotism

is one thing, partisanship is another; and that, as a fact, *every great cause* that has conferred immortality on its foremost agents, has given little other reward, nay, oftener than not, some species of martyrdom."—*Times Leader*, July 10, 1852.

Hahnemann, during forty years of his life, experienced a species of martyrdom, and some of his most distinguished followers have shared his fate in every country where Homœopathy has been introduced. One liberal physician, of deserved eminence, who advocated it before the Medical Society, and also in an essay on the subject, was so worried that his sensitive nature received a shock from which he never recovered. A liberal surgeon, also of deserved eminence, because he advocated it, according to his degree of light, never wholly adopting the new doctrine, but only practicing it where he saw his way, was pursued by the hostility of his *confrères*.

This is the inevitable consequence of taking a prominent part in the propagation of any proposed reform; but, though inevitable, it is painful not the less to those who so devote themselves.

But not only are such opposition and bitterness exhibited by those who are antagonistic to them; even many of those who are on their side are often cold and doubtful friends.

Simon de Montfort was not the only friend of his country that has found his Evesham. But the reward is not small for the performance of a duty even in one's lifetime, for the contentment of one's own conscience is a great satisfaction; so there is some agreeable counterpoise to the hostility of foes, the doubtful neutrality of some friends, and the cold indifference of others.

Wisdom and goodness should be linked together; true wisdom and true goodness are almost invariably associated. But the *worldly-wise* are seldom *good*, and the good are seldom worldly-wise. And so what is called wisdom and goodness are generally at odds. It is a pity, but this is human nature.

Some persons affect to regard Homœopathy as a mystery. The initiated know that the seeming mystery is a matter of common sense, of observation, of knowledge, and of science. Hear what Bishop Sherlock says on the subject of mystery:

"With respect to Infinite Wisdom, there is no such thing as mystery in nature; all things are equally clear in the understanding of the Deity, all things lie naked before His eye, having no darkness, obscurity, or difficulty in them. A mystery, therefore, is no art or positive thing in nature, nor is it anything that is inherent or belonging to the subjects of which it is predicated. When we say this thing or that thing is a mystery, according to the forms of our speech we seem to affirm something of this or that thing; but, in truth, the proposition is not affirmative with respect to the thing, but negative with respect to ourselves. For when we say this thing is a mystery, of the

thing we say nothing, but of ourselves we say we do not comprehend this thing with respect to our understanding. There is no more difference between truth that is and truth that is not mysterious, than, with respect to our strength, there is between a weight which we can lift and a weight which we cannot lift; for as defect of strength in us makes some weights to be unmovable, so likewise defect of understanding makes some truths to be mysterious."

This is a capital illustration; the workman that needs not to be ashamed, that knows disease and its multiform pictures, and that knows the remedies in all their groupings, can demonstrate by results that Homœopathy is no mystery in the vulgar sense. It is a thing of experience, not of guess. Those who have not applied the test of repeated experiments, are not in condition to gainsay our Medical Reform.

We are obliged to be didactic, while we should be glad to be learners. But we feel we are contending for a mighty principle; and we hope we have credit for right motives in thus continually pressing the importance of the struggle in which we are engaged. It is not to set a captive prince at liberty—it is not to establish a particular dynasty on a throne, but it is to set at liberty an immortal truth, pregnant with the greatest conceivable benefits to the human race, and it is to establish a Medical Reform which is for all time.

This is an enterprise to satisfy the ambition of the most noble and the most intellectual. Its end is the advantage, in respect of physical health, of the human race. The only persons from whom we should not expect sympathy—from all others we ought to demand and have it—are those who, right or wrong, are determined to believe that Allopathy is good and Homœopathy is evil.

We, however, who are engaged in this medical controversy in defence of what we believe to be right and true, are often goaded to the ill expression of the bitterness that is in every man's natural heart. But we take refuge in the contemplation of benign Nature, and in the humble recognition of the Author of all good—and so, in the midst of our annoyances and vexations, we sometimes, happily for our soul's health, fall into—

* * * "that serene and blessed mood,
In which the affections gently lead us on,
Until, the breath of this coporeal frame,
And even the motion of our human blood,
Almost suspended, we are laid asleep
In body, and become a living soul:
While with a heart made quiet by the power
Of HARMONY, and the deep sense of joy,
We see into the life of things."

So sang the truly philosophical poet Wordsworth. We, who advocate the medical law of Harmony, should be inexcusable if this exquisite strain did not enter into our souls.

We have felt the pain and the anguish of the parting with the beloved; and yet we know there is a harmony in the so-called death and

the so-called life. *This mortal is the shadow, that immortal life is the reality.*

We give utterance to thoughts not circumscribed by space nor lost in infinity. Our youth is past, but not our manhood; the dear light of our life is quenched, but not the stern purposes for which we live in this body. But from the Invisible to the Visible—from the *other* side to *this* side of that mysterious bourne which separates the "quick and the dead,"—we earnestly exhort all those who love Homœopathy because they believe it to be true, to join in one united effort for its propagation and advancement in these realms.

We have enemies without the camp, but the worst enemies we have are those within the camp—our *own*selves.

We want union not division; discipline not confusion; order not disorder; definite plans for definite purposes, not a Babel of many tongues, *the city of confusion.*

The spirit of *cliquism* is opposed to common sense and to justice. It ruined the republics of Greece and of Italy, and may ruin the great American Union.

The heroic Swede, heroic and right-royal, went to battle with a faith. He shed his blood at Lutzen, and his name will not perish among men. In the gyrations of fortune the grandson of a washerwoman sits on his throne—but he too may have an heroic heart. Why not?

We feel the necessity of devotion, of self-abnegation, of self sacrifice. Who are prepared to make it?

A Medical Reform, of inconceivable and unutterable benefit for the whole human race has been propounded; it is called by men Homœopathy, by what name it is known in other spheres we know not. There be thousands and tens of thousands in heroical Scotland, in time-honored England, and in noble though down-trodden Ireland, who have professed to receive this doctrine of Hahnemann.

But what has been done? What œcumenical councils have been held? where is the corporate action?

Why are spirits like Whately and Bunsen not more active? Why is the inheritor of the name, who boasts of the blood of the great Reformer in another department, like a dumb dog, giving forth no articulate sounds?

Is it that our age, and our *sect*—for such it is at present—are wanting in heroical spirits?

If we were eloquent we would speak to this theme; if we could evoke the spirit of a generous enthusiasm, we would do so; but none of us touch the hearts and consciences of our hearers and readers, or we should have more abundant fruits of our labors.—*Hom. Times.*

CASE OF ALBUMINURIA.

BY DR. PANTHIN, OF GENEVA.

(From the *Journal Gallican*, ii. 452.)

AFTER having been exposed, during the month of November, 1850, to a storm of rain for some

hours, I experienced several morbid sensations, the principal of which were, chills, momentary accessions of fever, debility, anorexia, loss of sleep, &c. I paid but little attention to them, and went on as usual. On the 3rd of December following, I was officially obliged to visit a very elevated point of the Jura for the purpose of examining the body of a keeper who had been found assassinated in the woods. It was cold and damp, and the mountain was immersed in a very thick fog, through which I walked for several hours to reach the spot where the body lay. We stayed there a considerable time, long enough to examine all the surroundings of the place that might by chance throw any light upon the circumstances of the crime, and to construct a litter of branches and leaves for the purpose of transporting the body to Crozet, a village at the foot of the mountain. While on the road thither, the guide stepped upon a rolling stone, and in the violent effort which he made to save himself from falling, struck me a severe blow with his elbow in the left side. I felt an acute pain in the place, but was able, after a few minutes, to resume our way, and arrived at Crozet, where I spent several hours of a cold damp night, in an ill-sheltered spot, engaged in the post-mortem examination.

From that time I began to suffer in the left side of the abdomen; some of the inguinal glands of that side swelled and became painful, while the region itself became somewhat swollen; a little œdema appeared in the left leg and foot, especially in the evening; loss of appetite; stools softer and more frequent, with less color; sleeplessness; night sweats producing no amelioration; irritable temper; weariness in the loins, especially when ascending. The œdema gradually extended into the left thigh. I had no time to take care of myself, and besides, I had always acted upon the principle of bearing all the afflictions sent upon me until they interfered with the performance of my duties. I continued my avocations, although the œdema did not diminish at night even. I took *Merc.* 4000, and my nights became better as well as my appetite, but without further relief. A repetition of the remedy four days subsequently produced no result, and I was obliged to keep my bed. On the 19th of December, I called in my friend Dr. Panthin, who prescribed *Calc.* 6500, but the diarrhœa and exhaustion continued to increase, and the other leg began to puff. The œdema progressed with considerable rapidity, reached the scrotum, abdomen, and even the upper parts of the body. During the night I experienced anguish and oppression, especially when lying on the left side. I then began to examine my urine; it was deep red, cloudy and scanty. Being left to myself, and remembering that some months previously I had observed an epidemic of scarlatina, seven or eight cases of which terminated by anasarca, with oppression and similar urine, which symptoms had disappeared after administering

Phos. 8000, I took the same remedy. I perceived no other change than the decrease of the dyspnœa; and on the 24th of December, had myself carried to Geneva, to Dr. Panthin's house; my face was exceedingly bloated; the upper eyelids œdematous; pale, yellowish complexion; I could sit up but a little while before feeling very weary and half fainting; my eyes were cast down; my memory was perceptibly weakened; I could not read, nor listen to conversation for any length of time without experiencing the fainting feeling I have referred to. I took *China* 300, one globule, then in drop-doses for several days, and gained a little strength; the œdema perceptibly diminished for some days, and I could remain longer up without the faintness. I was then better when in bed and after eating, but without any very appreciable cause the œdema of the upper and lower extremities and of the scrotum, the ascites, and puffing of the upper parts of the body, returned as strongly as ever. The swelling presented this peculiarity, that in the morning the face was very much swollen and the legs less, while in the evening this was reversed. I now had also for some days, when lying down at night, a sensation of anguish and agitation, with a feeling as though I should be suffocated, which obliged me to change my position every instant; my voice was very hoarse and occasionally extinguished, and one night I thought that *œdema glottidis* was about to terminate the scene. The urine, which had become more copious, was blackish, and deposited a very abundant sediment, looking like a reddish pus; nitric acid threw down flocks resembling the sediment, which re-dissolved in excess of acid; it was very frothy, and on boiling, gave a copious precipitate of albumen. Great flow of saliva for several days. Dr. Panthin prescribes *Merc.* 200; subsequently, *Ars.* 200. The symptoms of the chest diminished, but no remarkable change took place in the anasarca or urine. On the 29th of January, 1851, I took *Kali carb.* 300, and a notable amelioration of the dropsical symptoms became manifest. In a few days, however, some of the pathogenetic symptoms of the remedy appeared, such as pains in the chest, and especially about the præcordia, aggravated by inspiration; tearing in the left shoulder-joint, frequent cough, tormenting me excessively, especially at night, and finally, cough with expectoration like that of phthisical subjects. I then had for some days, almost at the same hour, attacks having the character of intermittent fever, ending in profuse perspiration. I took *Aconite* to diminish the violence of these attacks.

On the 5th of March, I took a fresh dose of *Kali carb.* 300. The anasarca and other symptoms disappeared by degrees almost entirely. There still remained œdema of the legs at night; the urine deposited a slight, faint red sediment on cooling, and boiling produced a considerable precipitate of albumen. I had regained my strength and could even

take walks of some length; I continued to be acutely sensitive to cold. During the months of April and May, I took several doses of *Kali carb.* On the 12th of April, I resumed my business, and notwithstanding the sudden changes of weather peculiar to our climate, have been able to continue it without interruption, and without any of the former symptoms, except that a little albumen was always manifest on boiling the urine. For five or six weeks back, however, I have often repeated this experiment without being able to discover the least trace of that substance. I may add, that the latter doses of the remedy were prepared by dissolving a single globule of *Kali carb.* 300, in a glass of water, and taking a single dessert-spoonful of the liquid. I have several times perceived the effects of this dose for some weeks. A similar dose of *Phos.* 8000, has frequently caused in me swelling of the bones, and falling off of the hair in spots, etc.

NOTABLE SCRAPS.

THE CIRCULATION OF THE BLOOD.

The circulation of the blood was the fortunate discovery of the immortal Harvey, and has paved the way for all the great improvements that have since been made in the science of medicine.

This doctrine at first met with universal opposition, and it was remarked that no physician past the age of forty believed in it; and in consequence, the practice of the great and good man declined from the moment he published to the world his ever memorable discovery.

The new doctrine at length getting into vogue, the senior physicians, says Malpighi, were inflamed to such a pitch at Bononia, that, in order to root out heretical innovations in philosophy and physic, they endeavored to get an act passed, whereby every graduate should be obliged to take the following additional clause to his solemn oath on receiving his degree:—"You shall likewise swear that you will, with all your might (*pro toto tui posse*), preserve and defend the doctrines of Hippocrates, Aristotle and Galen, which are taught in this University, and have been approved of during a long series of ages; and that you will not permit their principles and conclusions to be overturned by any person whatsoever."

Have not our Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew's acted towards Homœopathy virtually in the same manner?

THE SALIVA.

The valetudinarian, who reckons health as the first blessing, and as the means of enjoying and heightening all other blessings, should reflect on the utility of the saliva, and to remember that bread when buttered absorbs

little or no saliva; while a pound of dry bread carries with it the same weight of this necessary moisture.

The crust of bread is more digestible than the soft part, for solid substances are easier acted upon than glutinous.

SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

"If I had foreseen all the weight of *opposition* that has arisen against me, I would have left to others the pursuit of an empty shadow; but the reflection of being of service to my fellow-creatures affords a return for the inquietudes ever attendant upon literary exertions" (*vide* Sir Isaac Newton's Letter to Dr. Bentley).

TEA.

Whether green or bohea, is the produce of the same plant; the green tea being the shoots and earlier leaves, and bohea those more advanced and expanded. Green tea, made very strong, is an *emetic*. Bohea is also a popular remedy for *nausea* and *sick headache*.

A FEW RAMBLING THOUGHTS.

However violent the opposition to Hahnemann's system of medicine, it gradually progresses, causing such changes in the art of healing that it is no easy task to realise what has been accomplished during the last fifty years, towards the establishment of a true medical science, as well as a more certain cure of human maladies.

Almost daily we notice a yielding of our brethren of the allopathic school to the influence which Hahnemann, though dead, still exerts upon the profession generally. It is true, there are yet noisy, wordy, uneducated and unprincipled physicians who decry Homœopathy in the face of the strongest evidence in its favor, but their unwise proceedings are reacting upon themselves with a force that is destroying their influence in their own school, and also among the people.

Allopathic practice was never at such "loose ends" as at the present time. Numerous modifications are forced upon it by public opinion. The light which Hahnemann has thrown upon medicine, like the current of a tide, has been rising for half a century, while the rocks of prejudice and of ignorance which have opposed its progress; as well as the sea-weeds of timidity; and the decayed branches and trunks of the trees of indolence which find fastnesses in these rocks, are gradually disappearing out of sight by the rising pure water of truth.

When Galen's doctrines prevailed there was a pretense to principles in the allopathic school, but when his authority was thrown off, and Hahnemann's doctrine rejected, every practitioner of that school, like heathens, "are a law unto themselves." Each man does for the sick what seems right in his own eyes, and no one can call him to an account for his practice, however pernicious. Every practitioner falls back upon his own private judgment, and triumphantly employs in his defence a sort of modern unlimited liberty, which is not to be controlled by any rules, the result of the combined investigation and experience of the most talented, learned, and industrious practitioners.

It is a fearful state of things in medicine when each physician may treat the sick as he pleases, being responsible to no one, which is the case in the allopathic school. And even the homœopathic school is not fully awake to this important subject, in which not only is involved the system itself, but the health as well as the lives of our fellow men. The principles of Homœopathy are so clearly defined and so practical in their character, that it may always be known if the practitioner conducts the treatment of diseases on those principles; and he who places himself before the people as a homœopathist, is bound to observe strictly the established rules of his art, or be held responsible for ignorance or deception.

"It is my duty," says one, "to do the best I can for the sick I am called upon to treat." No one doubts this. But how are we to do the best we can for the sick? Are we at liberty to throw aside well-known and fully established laws for the treatment of diseases? Are we, under the excitement of the moment, to resort to measures which are proved to be uncertain or injurious by ample experience, and reject those which are proved in the hands of thousands to be the most certain and safe. The science of Homœopathy is established, and it can never change. Now, is a practitioner at liberty to adopt any supposed rule of practice inconsistent with those of the system he pretends to adopt? In a word, has a practitioner a right, a moral right, to deviate from the principles which constitute the science of Homœopathy? He has no such right. In it are found all the rules necessary for the ART. There can be no case of disease in which

it is possible to conceive of a rule for its treatment that is agreeable to common sense, nature of the disease, professional experience, and sound reasoning, that is not found in, or in fact is not a part of, the science of Homœopathy. The moment her laws are forsaken, then all is empiricism—all is quackery.

(For the American Journal of Homœopathy.)

"PROGRESSIVE HOMŒOPATHY FOREVER."

To show the beautiful working of Homœopathy, when it has drawn upon the resources of empiricism for "adjuvants," I would report the following case:—

A few weeks since, Mrs. F——, a very intelligent friend and patron of our system, while on a visit at a neighboring village, had occasion to call a physician for a little daughter who was suffering with pain and lameness in her foot. Being informed that a practitioner of Homœopathy was residing near, she dispatched a messenger to inquire if he was *really* a homœopathist, and if so, to call him in. The doctor came, and after examining the foot, was about to apply a liniment, mysteriously composed of various articles, (one of which was, doubtless, *known* to remove all trouble from the *bones*, another to quiet the *nerves*, a third to "draw out" the *inflammation*, and a fourth to "soften the skin,") when Mrs. F. remarked, "Sir, I thought you were a homœopathist." "So I am," the doctor replied. "How does it come, then, that you make use of such an article?" inquired Mrs. F. "I do it," said he, "because the people here must have something more *bulky* or *weighty* than the small pills in return for their money."

Disappointed in her expectations, and disgusted with his want of principle and honesty, Mrs. F., in the presence of a room-full, gave the doctor a good lecture on pure, consistent Homœopathy. To better himself, the shrewd physician in self-defence pleaded that he was an "*Eclectic*!" and thus, in a moment, stood beyond reproach on that broad platform where errors harmonise with truths—where men may play the wizard, sage or fool, and yet be all the same, *wise above all the "pathists," incomprehensible yet all comprehending Doctors!*

By men like the above, Homœopathy has been introduced into many villages and some cities in our land. The injuries to our system,

arising from such an introduction, in many instances, outweigh the benefits. In the village referred to, the professional dishonesty, as well as all the blunders and mean tricks of that infamous impostor will be charged to the account of Homœopathy; and the homœopathist who locates there in future years will be obliged to meet and dispose of those charges at no small expense of time, talent and money.

In the above case is also a fair exemplification of our system "progressed," "expanded" and "liberalised," to suit the taste of some in our ranks too deeply dyed in former errors to like it in its purity, and to catch others, who would but add it to their senseless combination of systems in the sublime school of Eclecticism.

D.

HOMŒOPATHISTS ARE NOT AT LIBERTY TO DISREGARD THEIR PRINCIPLES.

The opposition to Homœopathy is of the most violent character in some parts of our country. This fact should unite homœopathists in the great and important work in which they are engaged. There should be no yielding to the enemy in any way, for by so doing it would be regarded by some as an admission of doubt in us of the truth of the doctrine we profess to believe.

We reiterate what we have said many times through the columns of this Journal, that Homœopathy, as promulgated by Hahnemann, is true, and can be relied on in all cases of disease. The various modifications that have been suggested, and in too many instances acted upon, within the last few years, have, in our humble opinion, tended to merge it into Allopathy, and thus effectually destroy it, and in this way give advantage to the enemies of Hahnemann and his system.

We said years ago, that in our own ranks we should be likely to encounter an opposition the most difficult to manage, the truth of which is manifesting itself.

Allopathists charge upon Homœopathists that they forsake their principles and resort to allopathic measures in the treatment of diseases.

Such a charge will not apply universally, nor even generally, but still we most deeply regret to be compelled to admit that it is true. There are those in our ranks who bleed, who

give cathartics, who apply blisters, who administer anodynes, and who employ other allopathic measures to the great scandal of a true healing art. Such means, if necessary to cure any disease, is the strongest proof of not only the inadequacy of Homœopathy, but that it is, as its enemies assert, false and pernicious. These glaring inconsistencies are not so numerous as others, which are equally mischievous, though not so prominent. We refer to the use of the "mother tinctures" and the crude drugs of the shops, and also to the attenuation of medicines. In some cases we have known nearly a dozen different drugs given to the same person in a single day, and some thirty to the same patient in a single week. We have known seven drugs in solution in as many tumblers administered one after another hourly for several days, and this too by a professed and an acknowledged member of the homœopathic school. It would seem that a few among us who left the allopathic school, believe that they have the right to do just what they please in the treatment of diseases; that having thrown off a galling yoke, they will not hereafter wear a yoke at all. Those who prefer this kind of, we were about to say liberty, but the proper word is licentiousness, may do so, but they ought not to seek to connect themselves with the school of Homœopathy, which has fixed principles, from which its members are not at liberty to depart, under the obligations expressed as well as implied in the school, for thereby great injustice is done to true homœopathists. But, say some of our new-fledged editors and others, we will not acknowledge exclusiveness in any system of medicine; we will do as we please; we acknowledge the law of progression. They say, "prove all things," but are not careful to "hold fast that which is good."

Here we have plausibility, here we have absurdity, and here we have truth so mingled that for all practical purposes they destroy truth, and leave themselves with no exact ideas, no fixed principles, no clear views of Homœopathy, no principles for the treatment of diseases, but plunge themselves into the rankest kind of empiricism. Hereby such practitioners become formidable opponents to Homœopathy. Their ideas of liberty is without limit, and they admit of no restraining laws. They seek communion with the school to give them character, and then "deny their

faith by their works." We admit that every one has a right to do as he pleases, if he does not infringe the rights of others. A physician has no right to unite with the school of Homœopathy, and practically before the public deny the very principles which are essential to that system. He should formally withdraw himself from the school, and then whatever doctrine in medicine he sees fit to advocate would be consistent with justice and right, however erroneous the doctrine itself.

It is one thing to be a recognised member of the allopathic school and quite another thing to be a recognised member of the homœopathic. For this reason, in the former there is no pretense to a therapeutic law, no pretense to a complete science; in the latter it is her boast; and her excellence and superiority consists of a complete science, in which is a law of cure; a law that always governs drugs in the cure of diseases when administered in proper doses. She recognises but one such law.

Let it be understood that *similia similibus curantur* applies in Homœopathy to the action of drugs in the cure of diseases, and to them only. If water is a remedial agent, some other law, yet unknown, must govern it as such: for water is not a drug. If mesmerism can effect cures, then some law peculiar to it, yet undiscovered, must control it: for it is not a drug. We take it, that mesmerism is merely the influence which one living human body has on another living human body, and nothing more. We will go further, it is well known that what is termed mind, has influence for good or evil on the body it inhabits; and whatever the mind of a man can do to restore health to his body, if it can do anything for that purpose, it must be by virtue of a law peculiar to itself: for it too is not a drug. Now, those who speak of other laws of cure are hereby furnished with what they have never yet even hinted at, and if they will direct their attention to the discovery of laws which govern these agents, if it be true that they are curative, then they would do something useful; they would at least avoid throwing doubts about that which is fully established, and might discover something of value.

We have in our experience found beef-steaks and mutton-chops useful in the recovery of our patients, but we never suspected, nor do we now suspect, that the same law that causes

the curative effects of drugs, had anything to do with the beneficial effects of beef-steaks and mutton chops; they have a law peculiar to themselves, as physiologists teach. When as homœopaths we speak of a law of cure, we mean that which directs the action of drugs in a diseased human body, by virtue of which it is restored to health. And thus we claim philosophically, agreeably to our system, but one law of cure.

To prove that water has curative properties in the sense that drugs have, it is necessary to have the pathogenetic symptoms of water, for without these it is unreasonable to suppose that the same law governs both; and so of mesmerism. In the absence of the pathogenetic symptoms of minerals, plants, &c., the law of cure would never have been known. Water is a substance that cannot be dispensed with in the human system, either in health or in disease, and yet this fact does not prove it to be curative in a drug sense. It may be said that the presence of healthy persons around the bed of the sick is important to their recovery, by an influence that is imparted to the diseased person; and yet such effects are not likely, directed by the same law, which controls the curative power of drugs. That Christian duty of visiting the sick, and the widow and the fatherless in their affliction, may have more in it than is generally supposed for the recovery of health, and the relief of human sufferings. If Job's friends had continued their silence, or manifested by their acts a genuine sympathy or employed soothing words, their presence might have mitigated his sufferings; but they unwisely, although honest in their intention, violated some law, and the effect was to enhance Job's sufferings instead of diminishing them. It has been observed that an individual sick, desires the presence of some persons and is averse to that of others.

This cannot be accounted for on the principle of friendship, for it often happens that the presence of some of their friends is not only offensive but injurious. It is owing to an influence we cannot explain, which one person unconsciously exerts over another; and when acting from a healthy upon a sick person is agreeable and in a way not understood, is useful in promoting a cure; yet no one trusts to such means alone for the cure of diseases; nor can any one believe that the same law is in-

volved, as in the curative effects of drugs. Therefore we urge, that another law of cure medicine than that which is the basis of Homœopathy, is unnecessary, and as far as we are capable of judging could not be of any possible use. The positive knowledge we have of the pathogenesis of minerals and plants, would be utterly useless for practical purposes by any other law than *similia similibus curantur*. We conclude therefore, that those who are of the school of Homœopathy are not at liberty to depart in any case from those principles which constitute its very existence, for such conduct shows a want of confidence in practice of what is claimed in theory: and such a departure of necessity leads the practitioner into practical Allopathy, and thus he denies his faith by his works, and so far as his influence goes, involves his brethren to the great scandal of a true medical science, and endangers the health as well as the life of human beings.

HOMŒOPATHIC HOSPITAL IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

We have received an address to the friends of Homœopathy in New York, from the Trustees of the New York Homœopathic Dispensary Association, from which we extract the following, viz:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

New York, June 14, 1852.

The Committee of the Trustees of the New York Homœopathic Dispensary Association, to whom have been referred certain suggestions for establishing a Homœopathic Hospital in this City, have much pleasure in submitting to the Board of Trustees, their following unanimous

REPORT.

Your Committee have carefully considered the important subject referred to them, with a view to determine,

- 1st. The reasons which render the establishment of a Homœopathic Hospital especially desirable.
- 2d. The practicability of establishing such an institution in this city.
- 3d. The measures which, supposing the project to be feasible, would be most likely to promote its speedy and complete realization.

In entering upon the first part of their enquiry, your Committee may be permitted a passing allusion to the existing Dispensary, in order to record the deep sense they en-

tertain of the benefits which, by the blessing of God, that Institution has been the means of conferring on many hundreds of the poor of this city.

Far, however, from considering that the friends of Homœopathy should regard the happy results thus achieved, as filling up the measure of their hopes and aims, your Committee can only look upon them as an encouragement to higher efforts; and while thankfully remembering what has been done, they earnestly direct attention to the fact, that much yet remains to be done, not only to place Homœopathy on an equal footing before the public, with the medical systems it appears destined to supersede, but to develop and diffuse the full measure of benefit with which it is fraught.

To all earnest Homœopaths, who regard the doctrine of Hahnemann not as a toy with which they may blamelessly trifle, but as the expression of a law of nature, of a truth, the diffusion of which must powerfully promote the material well-being of society at large, the project of a Hospital, as a means to this end, must offer the strongest claims to support. It is easily shown, of such an Institution, that it would extend the sphere of our benificent system to cases which lie beyond the limits of Dispensary practice: that it would supply the only evidence of its kind which cautious men of science will admit to be unquestionable; and that it would afford to medical students facilities for investigation, and for acquiring experience in Homœopathic practice, not otherwise attainable. Thus while possessing claims upon the benevolent superior to those of a Dispensary, by reason of its greater resources for alleviating suffering; a Hospital commends itself to the attention of the far-sighted philanthropist by the influence it is calculated to exert upon opponents of the medical profession, and through them on the healthy advancement of Homœopathy. Another consideration lying beyond these, is the moral effect which the very establishment of such an Institution would have on the public mind. It would be seen that the advocates of Homœopathy, with the boldness which ever characterises a strong faith, do not shrink from the severest test to which their system can be subjected; that they do not confine themselves to ingenious speculations or well constructed theories, or rely on evidence liable to be disputed, but are content to peril their cause in a fair comparison with rival systems, and to appeal to tangible facts open to the most searching scrutiny. To the timid measures of a wavering faith, earnest thoughtful men do not give heed. Where they see an earnestness and a steadfastness like their own at work, their sympathies are strongly enlisted. It is well to reflect on the influence of a Hospital in carrying conviction to the minds of such as these; who by natural rank, and

not by adventitious titles, are the leaders and guides of public opinion.

In concluding this part of their Report, your Committee have only to add their conviction, that the establishment of a Homœopathic Hospital is an object worthy of the most strenuous exertions of the friends of the system in this city.

Your Committee now proceed to submit their views on the second point of inquiry, namely, the practicability of such a project at the present time; and they take this opportunity to acknowledge the important assistance they have derived from information laid before them regarding one of the two Homœopathic Hospitals, founded about two years ago in the English capital.

Allowing for certain differences of social constitution and condition between the two cities of London and New York, which, however, rather seem to affect some of the details of the question, than to influence a general view of comparative advantages and difficulties, it is impossible for your Committee to reflect on the results which the energy and prudence of our English friends have achieved, without drawing very great encouragement in weighing the possible issue of similar proceedings here.

Your Committee have no means of ascertaining with exactness the relative numbers of lay homœopathists in London and New York; nor can they determine with accuracy the difference in wealth and influence between the two constituencies. They are, however, credibly informed, that at the time the two Homœopathic Hospitals, now existing and thriving in London, were founded, the number of medical practitioners of the system, in that city, was not more than one-third of the number of Homœopathic practitioners at this time in New York; and the inference that the present constituency in the latter city is at least as large as that which existed in the former, at the period referred to, seems therefore a very safe one. Your Committee are also assured, that the London Hospitals owe their existence and support, and are practically under the direction and management of persons engaged in professional and mercantile pursuits; derive comparatively little advantage from the aristocratic patronage, of which, according to Old World usages, they partake in common with similar institutions; and receive no aid whatever from any national or municipal fund.

Your Committee annex to their report some interesting and valuable statistics, extracted from the published reports of the London Homœopathic Hospital for the years ending respectively 31st March, 1851, and 31st March, 1852. It will be perceived, on reference to these returns, that in both years a considerable balance of cash remained for investment, after providing for the necessary expenditure; a circumstance

your Committee are assured, is owing as much to the rigid but not niggardly economy observed, as to any other cause. A scrutiny of the items, shows, indeed, that they could not be adopted as absolute data for the guidance of those who seek to establish a similar Hospital here; as a whole, however, the inference they afford is encouraging, especially as they are said to fall far short of the lowest estimates formed, when the proposition to found a Hospital was first agitated in London. To the medical reports of cases it is not necessary to allude, as they speak satisfactorily for themselves.

After a careful consideration of the foregoing facts, and in view of the rapid progress of Homœopathy in New York during the past few years, your Committee cannot hesitate to express their strong belief that a bold and earnest appeal to the friends of the cause in this city, seconded by a well organized plan for obtaining contributions, would be attended by complete success.

But in thus affirming the practicability of establishing a Hospital, your Committee desire to state explicitly, and to avoid the possibility of misconstruction, that they contemplate, at the commencement, an institution of no greater pretensions in kind and capacity, than those to which they have adverted as examples, viz: the two Hospitals in London. A substantial house, in an airy and convenient situation, and capable of accommodating from twenty-five to thirty patients, would fully answer their immediate expectations.

Your Committee proceed finally to state the measures which they would recommend to be immediately taken in order to realize the project in view with the least possible delay.

[Here follow a series of recommendations, which, as they have special relation to the proceedings of the Board, it is not necessary to particularize.]

In framing the foregoing suggestions, your Committee have endeavored to avoid entering into premature details:—They have confined themselves to the preliminary measures which they feel might advantageously be adopted. With a few brief words they now close their Report. As the subject under consideration has become more familiar, the momentous issues involved in it have been brought more distinctly into view, and the sense of its importance has commensurately increased. Under this impression your Committee venture to hope that their Report will be the initiatory step in a movement which will proceed henceforth with increasing energy, and know no pause until its purpose be fully accomplished.

Signed on behalf of the Committee:

JON. STURGES, *Chairman.*

In view of the above report the Trustees say:

It will be clearly understood, after the perusal of the foregoing Report, that the project contemplated, and which it is the purpose of this address to submit to the friends of Homœopathy in this city, is the conversion of the New-York Homœopathic Dispensary into a Hospital, on the limited scale of the two Hospitals now in successful operation in London; retaining, however, the present provision for the treatment of out-patients. It is also contemplated that the government of the new Institution, regarded as a development of the existing Dispensary, shall devolve on the Board of Trustees of the Dispensary Association, and their duly elected successors.

To attain the object in view, it is proposed:—

- 1st. That a collection be set on foot, amongst the friends of Homœopathy in New-York, to raise funds in donations and annual subscriptions, for the establishment and support of the projected Hospital.
- 2d. That all sums, so collected, be paid to the New-York Life and Trust Company, to the joint account of B. R. WINTHROP, JONATHAN STURGES, and THOMAS DENNY, Esqs., Trustees of the New-York Homœopathic Hospital Fund; there to accumulate until a sum shall have been raised, sufficient to justify the Board of Trustees in proceeding to realise the wishes of the subscribers.
- 3d. That a suitable house be ultimately hired, capable of accommodating from 25 to 30 patients, with their needful attendants, and that it be furnished with a strict regard to economy as well as convenience.

It is proper to add, that a committee has been appointed to draw up a code of Rules and Regulations for the proposed Hospital: these, when they shall have passed under the revision of the Board, will be published for the information of the subscribers.

Having thus put their project before the public, and explained the grounds on which they believe it to be entitled to the support of the Homœopaths of New-York, the Board of Trustees have little more to add, beyond the announcement that donations and subscriptions will be gladly received on its account by all the members of their body, and also by the medical officers of the Dispensary, whose names and addresses, with those of the Trustees, are given in the list facing the title page. It is their hope that the numerous friends of the cause in this city will manifest their sympathy with the present movement by a cordial and active co-operation with its promoters: remembering that where many are engaged in bringing about a single result, the labor of individuals is proportionately light. If each, as it has been well observed, will collect from all who may be willing to give, any sum, however small, the aggregate

collection, with the larger contributions that may be confidently expected, will constitute a fund amply sufficient to give birth to the undertaking. Once in operation the Institution will doubtless assert its own claims to public support, by means of the facts it will speedily accumulate.

But, in making this suggestion, the Board desire to be understood as in no way recommending a mode of solicitation which implies that any personal favor is asked or conferred;—such a course would neither accord with the dignity of the cause advocated, nor with the motives of advocates who have no private interest at stake in the issue. It is desirable that what is bestowed should be of the nature of free-will offerings, owing much to the good will and nothing to the weakness of the donors.

“In conclusion,” to quote the language of a great philanthropist “it only remains to urge upon those who recognize the doctrine, the responsibility which that recognition involves. It is not enough that they should use the truth and congratulate themselves on the personal advantages they derive from it. It would never have reached them but for the labors of others, and these they are bound in turn to take up, so that the light which has been freely bestowed upon them may be as freely communicated to their fellows. It is a common thing for persons to dream of the good they would do, if they had but the ‘opportunity;’ but opportunity always lies at our feet, if we had but the will to see it. At all events, let those who recognize Homœopathy never trust to the plea that the means of usefulness have been denied to them. They must reflect that a great Truth has been given to them in charge; that, this truth is not destined to perish; and that if those who have been called to carry it forward falter in their task, the opportunity now their own will be snatched from them and given to others. If they avail themselves of its benefits, and deny it before the world, or coldly withhold acknowledgment of their belief, they will doubtless find their reward in the consciousness that they have maintained their popularity, and discreetly sacrificed the future to the present. As slaves of opinion, however, it is their fate, unfortunately, never to know rest; they must shift their course with its shifting tides, and always be on the watch, lest at one time they commit themselves by denying, and at another, by acknowledging too much. While, on the other hand, he who relies upon truth, regardless of all else, occupies the same position when it becomes universally admitted, as he filled when it was universally contemned. He has, moreover, the consciousness of a task fulfilled; and, looking back at the close of life, to the time when the doctrine it was his privilege to receive was first struggling into view, and tracing it in

its gradual extension over the earth, he is able to ask himself, with a glad certainty of the reply, 'What has been my portion in this great work?'"

Signed on behalf of the Board,

B. R. WINTHROP, *President.*

New-York, Aug. 31, 1852.

NOTE.—Those friends to the cause who may be willing to aid the present movement, by privately collecting the voluntary contributions of their friends and acquaintance, are requested to pay the amounts so received, from time to time, to one of the Trustees of the Dispensary Association, accompanied on each occasion by a memorandum of the names of the contributors. A list of donations and subscriptions received will in [due] time be published.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

BENJN. R. WINTHROP, PRESIDENT, 10 Wall street.
N. N. HALSTED, 1st. V.-PRESIDENT, 23 Willam st.
W. H. MACY, 2d V.-President, 189 Front st.
THOS. DENNY, TREAS., 8 Jauncey Court, Wall st.
WM. K. LOTHROP, SECRETARY, 46 Water st.
Jona. Sturges, 125 Front street.
J. R. Leroy, 26 Lafayette Pl.
Wm. C. Bryant, 18 Nassau st.
Wilson G. Hunt, 80 William st.
Roe Lockwood, 411 Broadway.
P. S. Van Rensselaer, 18 Wall st.
Henry James, 58 West 14th st.
Samuel R. Betts, 16 St Mark's Place.
John W. Edmonds, 80 Lexington Av.
Stephen Cambreleng, 18 Wall st.
Orsamus Bushnell, 20 Nassau st.
W. W. T. Greenway, 45 Broadway.
John T. Adams, 89 Wall st.
John T. Bruce, 175 Pearl st.
John Gray, 210 East Broadway.
J. S. Harberger, 40 Wall st.
A. Thornton, 94 Pearl st.
Geo. Platt, 53 Broadway.
G. C. Satterlee, 54 Wall st.
J. T. S. Smith, 488 Broadway.
R. M. Stratton, 242 Water st.
A. W. Sus, 119 Pearl st.
Isaac C. Kendall, 139 Broadway.
A. J. T. Giraud, 42 Fourth st.
Joshua L. Pope, 98 Pine st.
R. W. Heurtley, 109 Water st.
J. J. Hyde, 21 Maiden Lane.
W. F. Van Wagenen, 54 and 56 Exchange Pl.
Archd. Russel, 45 Tenth st.
David C. Halsted, 119 Maiden Lane.

MEDICAL OFFICERS OF THE DISPENSARY.

ATTENDING PHYSICIANS.

J. M. Allen, M.D., 1 Washington Square.
H. D. Appleton, M.D., 88 Fourth Avenue.
E. H. Bartlett, M.D., 128 Bleecker st.
Jacob Beakly, M.D., 35 Clinton Place.
E. V. Brown, M.D., 126 Eldridge st.
J. T. Curtis, M.D., 193 Bleecker st.
M. Frelich, M.D., 88 Prince st.
E. Guernsey, M.D., 19 West 22d st.
C. Kiersted, M.D., 227 West 30th st.
H. Kinsley, M.D., 111 Amity st.
S. R. Kirby, M.D., 72 Tenth st.
James Mairs, M.D., 462 Broome st.
J. W. Metcalf, M.D., 31 St Mark's Place.
J. C. Peters, M.D., 742 Broadway.
A. Reisig, M.D., 33 West 14th st.
W. Stewart, M.D., 141 Eighth st.
L. T. Warner, M.D., 49 Lafayette Place.
J. A. McVicar, M.D., 838 Broadway.

CONSULTING PHYSICIANS.

John F. Gray, M.D., 49 Lafayette Place.
E. Bayard, M.D., 1 Waverly Place.
F. Vanderburgh, M.D., 5 Great Jones st.
A. Gerald Hull, M.D., 49 Lafayette Place.
R. M. Bolles, M.D., 249 Fourth st.
A. D. Wilson, M.D., 42 Walker st.

PHARMACEUTIST.

John T. S. Smith, 488 Broadway.

"The Homœopathists are presumed not to understand Anatomy," said a young and vain graduate of our city. This young man won't live long, he is too precocious.

"The prevalence of dysentery in our city" said an allopathist, "is owing to the folly of the people in employing homœopathists." There's wisdom, a large chunk of it.

"I have no doubt," said a gentleman in a rail car to his friend, "my wife would be living now, if I had not employed a homœopath." "Indeed," said the friend, "I thought the allopathic physicians had pronounced her case incurable." "Yes, they did, but I do'n't mind that, I shall always believe she was killed by Homœopathy, or else why did she die?"

"Do you trust to Homœopathy?" said a lady to her friend. "Yes," was the reply. "I am astonished that you should do so, for my physician says it is one of the humbugs of the age." "Your physician is an allopathist."

A popular objection to Homœopathy is the "small doses." Her practitioners cannot be knaves, or they would not oppose the prejudices of the people in favor of large doses.

The East Tennessee Record of Medicine and Surgery, published in Knoxville, urges that it is necessary for the people to be informed on the subject of medicine. We agree with the record in this; but it is a hazardous undertaking for allopathy.

Dr. D. M. Dake's communication on the ORGAN of the Cleveland Homœopathic College will appear in our next.

NOTICE.

Eight copies of this Journal can be had for five dollars; twenty copies for ten dollars, and fifty copies for twenty dollars, cash in advance. The friends of Homœopathy, at a small expense, can give an extensive circulation to the American Journal of Homœopathy, which might be the means of spreading a knowledge of the system of medicine it advocates.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, OCTOBER, 1852.

NO. 6.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

SHORT COMINGS OF THE OLD SYSTEM —THE NEW SYSTEM BETTER.

I believe it is said that men with limited attainments like to dwell on small things. I do not care to dispute this maxim, even though my remarks should appear to afford an instance of its truth, for I lay no claim to greatness in my vocation. I will say, however, that sometimes much depends upon a small matter, as may be seen when we view the great developments around us in the works both of nature and of art, which have had small beginnings; and, therefore, that it is not always the part of wisdom to despise small things, simply for the reason that they are small.

In your Journal for July last you were pleased to insert a very short and hastily written article, the object of which was to show, and that by the help of a tolerably clear *argumentum ad hominem*, that, notwithstanding their lofty pretensions to the exclusive possession of all the learning, the gentlemen of the Old School have *something* yet to learn. Doctor Forbes, Physician to the Queen of England, has made it pretty plain that this something is no trifle, and his sentiments have since been pretty extensively endorsed by his brethren.

The quotation in that article, from the published writing of an old school doctor of our city, though in itself a small thing to dwell on, is really pregnant with much that is decisive in the controversy between the two schools. Allow me to reproduce it in full:—

"I find that small doses of Ipecacuanha will stop the vomiting, and that small doses of Rhubarb will stop the diarrhœa—a strange anomaly, surely."

Here is the announcement of a new dis-

covery in the allopathic camp; but it is extremely limited, it being confined to two drugs only. It is to be regretted that the learned gentleman did not extend his researches to other drugs as well as to these two. Another thing to be regretted is, that no *principle* has been discovered or talked of. The "small doses" cure: this is what we are told, and this is about all; for, as to the *why* or *wherefore*, as to the *principle* upon which the cure is effected, nothing is said, and we are left fairly in the lurch. The discoverer seems, indeed, to have had a squint at something of the sort when he was writing the words "a strange anomaly;" but, surely, it might have struck his mind that it is amongst the doings of erring mortals we should look for strange anomalies; not in the workings of unthinking matter. However that may be ruled, let us for the present, at least, be content with what we have got; it is not much, to be sure, but it is something; "half a loaf is better than no bread." We have found "small doses" cure; this is something; by and by we may find the principle.

Well, the gentleman has discovered the *uses* of two drugs; for, as to their *abuse*, there was no need to discover *that*. That has been long known and widely practised. Ipecacuanha and Rhubarb, in their gross state, were, I might almost say, shovelled into the stomachs of men, women and children; and then there was an accession of suffering—vomiting and diarrhœa with many other clear indications of poisoning—and this was, and yet is, called the "rational method" of *curing*. Ah! it is well that we are at length delivered from this "rational" method. We now take "small doses"—doses so small and so prepared, as that the disgusting "sensible qualities" of the drug are not only got rid of, but its benign cura-

tive power developed and applied to the sufferings of grateful humanity.

Here, if anywhere, is the true explanation of that seeming paradox which is in everybody's mouth, but in few men's understanding, namely, that medicine can both "kill and cure." It is not that the same drug and same quantity of it will kill one person and cure another, as the popular and professional blunder has it. No such thing—but that small, or homœopathic doses of a medicine will cure a natural disease which is similar to the artificial one, which large, or allopathic doses of the same medicine are known to produce in healthy persons.

Is it not a wonder that a man belonging, to a school of medicine which is guided in almost all its movements by sheer conjecture, should not have seized hold of the notion, from the fact that he had discovered, that, between vomiting, in natural sickness, and Ipecacuanha, God may have established the long unknown relationship of disease and cure; that, possibly, large doses of that drug produced the very sickness of which it was designed that the drug, in small doses, should be the specific remedy; that, as the "strange anomaly" went further, namely, to Rhubarb, it might be that it reached still further yet, in fact, comprehended all drugs; that this relationship might, possibly, be under the government of special laws, to discover which was the chief business of professional men, and that such a course would be more in accordance with a "rational" system of medicine and the lofty pretensions to all the learning, than the giving of drachms and ounces of coarse and nauseous and sickening drugs, on the principle that Thomas had it from Richard, who had it from Henry; that they proved of service in diseases going by the same name as the one in view; or, on the equally enlightened principle, that the drug was *supposed*, from its smell, taste, etc., to be capable of removing the internal obstruction which was *supposed* to exist, and which was *supposed* to be the cause of the present disease? Is it not strange that the gentleman alluded to did not conjecture something of this sort, when he made the discovery which he himself has recorded?

This, perhaps, would be descending to niceties, a practice beneath the dignity of a routine system, rioting in the confidence of

place and power. When a deviation *does* occur, it is deemed better, it seems, to proceed on the principle of further guessing, or of "strange anomalies."

On account of being ignorant of the law of cure, what a fearful system that of Allopathy is! It begins by giving doses so coarse and massive as that sickness, not health, is almost invariably the result; the quantity of each successive dose is then increased, until the violence of the reactive efforts of the organism gives evidence of the approach of death.

How different is Homœopathy. Profiting by the kind hints, as it were, of nature, and borrowing light from the few recorded yet transient sparks of truth which passed across the mental vision of a few great medical men of both ancient and modern times, she has gone to work in the right direction, and, in the main, performed the grand achievement, the honor of which belongs to the immortal Hahnemann.

She proves her medicines, in the first place, on those in perfect health; she notes down, carefully, the sick symptoms that follow; she as carefully preserves the sacred record, for it is the record of such symptoms as, occurring in natural disease, the Giver of all good intended those very medicines, respectively, to cure. She gives small doses; why not, when large ones hurt? Is not a burn cured by a dose of heat smaller than that which caused the burn? Is not the dose of cold which cures a frost bite smaller than the one which caused it? And, as to the diseases, even of the mind, what wise man would not take the heart oppressed with grief to the "house of mourning," rather than to the "house of feasting?" *for*, surely, it is "better;" the dose here is, indeed, large, but only to those immediately concerned; to the stranger, it comes diluted; for he takes it not so much by actual participation as by contemplation.

There is yet another feature in the quotation, to be noticed. It tells us that small doses of Ipec. will cure "vomiting," and that small doses of Rhubarb will cure *diarrhœa*: but nothing is said of the *sort* of vomiting, or *sort* of diarrhœa, or of the accompanying symptoms. This is in accordance with Allopathy, which is a *generalizing* system, but will not, at all, chime in with

Homœopathy. There are forms of vomiting and many forms of diarrhœa which cannot be cured even by "small doses" of the two drugs mentioned, but, for the cure of which, Homœopathy has the true specifics, I might say, at her fingers' ends.

New York, Sept., 1852.

JUSTICE.

THE QUESTION SETTLED—HOMŒOPATHISTS ANNIHILATED.

C. H. F. Routh, M.D., M.R.C.S., &c., &c., of London, has written a book of 85 pages 8vo., entitled, "On the fallacies of Homœopathy and the imperfect statistical inquiries on which the results of that practice are estimated." This production of Dr. Routh has been favorably reviewed by "The British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review." The gist of the work of Routh and the Review can be stated in few words. They agree that homœopathists are a set of low fellows, with a strong propensity to lying, and of course unworthy of confidence. This is the basis of what Dr. Routh and the Review has to say of Homœopathists. On the contrary they say that allopathists are gentlemen, they love the truth and hate Homœopathy and her practitioners. On this foundation they build, and they do it with ease; for Homœopathists being all liars, their statistics of cures of cholera and other diseases are all false, got up to "humbug" the people, who, Dr. Routh or the Review, we don't remember which, virtually says are *asses*, and cannot understand figures; but allopathists are all honest, honorable men, and their statistics are worthy of confidence. This embraces the essential part of the publication, and whoever can approve of Routh's reasoning is exceedingly deficient in ordinary mental endowments.

Those most experienced in Homœopathy testify to its great value. Among physicians, those who have studied it thoroughly, and practised it strictly are hardly tempted to resort, under any circumstances, to allopathic measures. If Homœopathy has any truth in it, it is all true; for it is an assemblage of facts, dependent one upon the other, therefore she must be received in whole, or rejected in whole. It is proved that she is adapted to all human maladies, and even in hopeless cases, her power soothes the dying

sufferer in his passage to the world of spirits.

Upon these grounds we do not perceive any reason in the assertion "that Homœopathy is appropriate to some diseases, and not to others." This error has led many to abandon what is true for that which is false.

Allopathic physicians, generally, do not understand Homœopathy, they have never studied it in the only proper way. Simply reading the *ORGANON*, and other works, can never furnish a proper knowledge of Homœopathy. It must be tried in the legitimate way, and one man's experience is not enough to confirm one in that system of medicine; but the combined experience of hundreds places it beyond a doubt.

Allopathists complain of their name—they do not like the word allopathy to designate their mode of practice. But they can never remove the term, it will stick to them. And it should.

THE MEDICAL TREATMENT OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

The London correspondent of the *New York Herald*, when speaking of the death of the Duke of Wellington, says:—

"After all, a great lesson is afforded by his death to medical practitioners, for though no one supposes it would have done him any good to live any longer, yet he cannot be said to have died from age, but rather from the mistake of the medical men who were about him. A young man of thirty years treated in the same way, would have succumbed under the treatment. The Duke was subject to epileptic fits, and, as is well known to those who have had experience in the matter, such fits are intimately connected with the stomach, and are preceded by a sense of a load at that region. This sensation is the prelude to the fit, and should be met with stimulants, to keep off the spasmodic action which brings on the fit. The medical men, however, took no notices of the Duke's complaint, who attributed his sense of weight at the stomach to mere indigestion; a good dose of ether or brandy, or some other diffusive stimulant, would have set all to rights; but the doctor took no notice, and ordered him tea and toast. Then, again, afterwards, when the old Duke began to shiver with the epileptic fit, they gave him emetics, which were quite enough to kill him, and he died. Age has nothing to do with the immediate cause of death; for it

a man fall into a ditch and break his bones, and people stand on the edge of the ditch and pummel him to death, it would not signify whether the man was young or old; he must die, if he were not carefully and properly lifted out of the ditch. No doubt the excessive anxiety of medical men, in the cases of the high and noble, operates to lead their judgment astray. Sir Robert Peel was sacrificed in this way, out of pure delicacy, for the surgeons did not know what or where the fracture was, till he was dead. They were afraid to disturb him by examining where he was wounded by his fall. There is something of a lesson in all these things."

It is a much more serious matter for a great man to become sick, than for others. Not only may the Duke be an instance, but such cases have been numerous in this country. No doubt Washington died prematurely from the treatment he received from his physicians. And the same is also believed in the cases of several of our Presidents and Senators. Yet we do not blame the physicians, for they performed their duties faithfully according to the theories of the allopathic school. The fault is not in the practitioner, but in the practice. Whoever, in this day, submits to allopathic treatment in any of its thousand forms, should attach no stigma to those who treat them, but the blame is with themselves. They close their eyes to the light which exposes the pernicious tendencies of allopathic measures.

It is remarkable how blindly indifferent most persons are to the kind of medical treatment they adopt. In all the business affairs of life, a thorough investigation is had, all the facts are duly considered, and great care is taken that the reasoning is based upon the facts proved by experiment, so that mistakes may be avoided. The modern motto is practically adopted, "Be sure you are right, then go ahead." But this is not the case in medicine. In that there is a belief in what is absurd. The most unreasonable promises of the openly avowed quack, the more refined and dignified pretensions of the diplomated empiric, acting upon minds inclined to believe, on no rational basis, in omens and prognostics, as coming directly from a supernatural agency, influence thousands to jeopardise their health and life. But we trust the period is at hand when the people will become rationally considerate on the important subject of

medicine, that they may avoid that which is evil, and pursue that which is good.

REMARKS ON A RULE OF THE "CODE OF ETHICS" OF THE "AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION."

The following is extracted from the code of *ethics* of the "American Medical Association":—

"No one can be considered as a regular practitioner, or a fit associate in consultation, whose practice is based on an *exclusive dogma*, to the rejection of the accumulated experience of the profession, and of the aids actually furnished by anatomy, physiology, pathology, and organic chemistry."

The above Association was organised a few years ago, and designed to embrace every diplomated allopathic physician in these United States. It holds its meetings annually, and heretofore the attendance has been large, almost every state and county being represented. This Association is, therefore, the highest authority in the country of the allopathic school, and whatever emanates from it should be regarded as the voice of that school.

The "American Medical Association," at the time of its organisation, appointed a committee of its ablest members to prepare a system of rules for regulating the conduct of its members, and dignified it by the term, "Code of Ethics;" in which may be found the above extract, which we propose briefly to examine. That rule was intended to reach homœopathic practitioners. It is a vain attempt to place these in the public mind among quacks and ignorant pretenders to medical knowledge. It may be regarded as a "BULL," fulminated by the great medical congress of allopathists in this country. It is proper, therefore, that we should look into it and see how far it is applicable against what it may be aimed.

But for the painful ignorance on the subject that is manifested by these gentlemen who constitute the American Medical Association, we could scarcely suppose that it was peculiarly directed against practitioners of Homœopathy.

The word "*dogma*," in the above extract, means a doctrinal notion in medicine. How far does Homœopathy come within

this definition? Homœopathy claims to be a law in therapeutics; and by such law we mean the inherent principle by which the disordered functions of the human body are restored to their healthy condition; or in other words, the law of cure. As well might the great law of gravitation, which governs and controls the globe we live in, and the myriads of worlds above us, be stigmatised an "exclusive dogma" because it is based, like Homœopathy, upon a well ascertained natural law, and call it "exclusive" because it is well defined and simple, like all the great principles of nature.

Homœopathy is no "exclusive dogma." It is a principle synthetically established by the accumulated experience of physicians from Hippocrates to the present time, and fully developed by the great Hahnemann.

It is the great law by which drugs cure; and such being the case the homœopathic physician cannot vary from it. As well might the engineer, in calculating the distance which his projectiles would fall, reject as too exclusive the law of gravitation.

Is it right to say we adhere to an "exclusive dogma" when we adopt nature's own law to the exclusion of the vagaries and fine-spun theories of the human intellect—the empirical practice—the doctrines of this or that man who may happen to be a little above his fellows. If by this is meant "the rejection of the accumulated experience of the profession," homœopaths are honored thereby. Those who understand Homœopathy would not insinuate that her practitioners reject "the aids actually furnished by anatomy, physiology, pathology and organic chemistry." Her *materia medica* is based upon anatomy, physiology and pathology, and in a sense too, far more extensive and exact than is dreamed of by the combined knowledge of the American Medical Association. When a genuine homœopathist examines a case of disease, of necessity the above three branches must come in, they cannot be kept out. When he seeks the remedy by the *Materia Medica*, again the same three branches come in, they cannot be excluded. On a thorough examination of this subject it will be found that the homœopathic system is the only one that makes a suitable use of anatomy, physiology, and pathology. As it regards

"organic chemistry," it has been so recently promulgated, that, as yet, neither allopathists nor homœopathists know how to use it for curative purposes. The rule from the "code of ethics," upon a fair construction does not reach homœopathists, as was intended, and we really do regret that the combined knowledge of the whole allopathic school in this country, should have exposed so much ignorance in so few words; and that that school should so unwisely make such exorbitant claims of rank and dignity; and that it should presume so much on its influence on the public mind, for the purpose of preventing all reform in the art of medicine, unless it tends to perpetuate the confidence of the people in Allopathy. We say we deeply regret all this, for it has more the aspect of a party of politicians seeking places of honor and emolument, than the humble, honest, industrious, persevering seekers after truth.

HOMŒOPATHIC CONGRESS.

The third annual meeting of homœopathic physicians was held in Edinburgh on the third and fourth of last month. Dr. Henderson, Professor of Pathology in the Edinburgh (allopathic) University, was unanimously elected chairman, who opened the Congress with the following remarks, as reported in the "Homœopathic Times:"—

"Gentlemen, I thank you cordially for having placed me in the chair on this occasion, for I esteem it a very great honor, indeed, to be called on to preside at the first Homœopathic Congress held in my native country. We have, I think, reason to congratulate ourselves that so many have been able to attend at this Congress; and, I think, we have evidence of the interest taken in this subject in the circumstance of so many coming from distant parts of the country to be present amongst us. The institution of scientific associations, for the purpose of meeting periodically at different places, may be regarded as peculiar to this busy, enterprising age, and the purposes they serve are both important and manifold. If they do not actually plant the lamp of science where its light had been previously unknown, they at least refresh it with oil, and make it burn the brighter in the places they visit. They awaken a public interest—a popular interest in the progress of useful knowledge, more than local, stationary, and more familiar societies usually do; and

by bringing together laborers from different parts of the fields of science and from different countries, they quicken the interchange of new truths, and enliven their devotion to their favorite studies by affording them opportunities of intercourse with persons of different tastes. These advantages are common to all such associations, but our advantage is peculiar to ourselves in the existing circumstances of our profession, and, indeed, of medical science itself. I have no intention either to deprecate the hostility of those who treat us with bitterness and misrepresentation, or of entering into any detail on the subject. I advert merely to that speciality in our own condition, which makes meetings like this peculiarly pleasant and profitable. Scattered as we are, each in our own place, singly, or in small companies, over the three kingdoms, exposed everywhere to the treatment I have referred to, it is exceedingly encouraging and delightful to behold, as on this occasion, so many who maintain the same just principles—so many whose names are familiar to us as the defenders of those great truths, which we all know from experience to be by far the most important in the whole range of medicine. 'As iron sharpeneth iron, so does the countenance of a man that of his friend,' is a proverb the truth of which must be felt by all of us on an occasion like this. I feel satisfied that when this Congress is dispersed, each will return to the sphere of his arduous and responsible avocations with a zeal and a resolution strengthened by the opportunity he has had of personal intercourse with so many that hold the same great principles in medicine, and have the same experience as himself. As you are about to be addressed on some important and interesting topics connected with the present position and prospects of our science, I shall not trespass further on your time, but before sitting down, I again thank you for the honor conferred on me."

We notice with regret that some of the members fell into the too common error of physicians, of generalizing from a single case. To assume a general rule of practice in medicine from the result of one or a few cases is not sound reasoning; and if so, of course should be avoided, especially by those who are seeking such a reform in medicine as will establish a true healing art.

If it could be proved beyond a doubt that allopathic measures are indispensable to cure any case of disease, a foundation would be laid for an argument against Homœopathy that could not be answered easily.

The "Times" pertinently asks: "Why should we not all imitate the experience of

the Master before we begin to dogmatise and theorise? Is he unworthy of credence?"

"It is strange, passing strange," that before Hahnemann's disciples have had time to properly repeat his experiments—before they have tested his practice in the only way, by doing as he did, some of them set about a modification of it, and try, in some instances, to make it appear to simulate as much as possible its opposite—Allopathy. One would suppose that he who has only a limited knowledge of Homœopathy would at once perceive the absurdity of such an attempt.

We place before our readers the observations of Dr. Prince, by which the character of a debate that sprung up in the Congress may be understood. We do not concur with Dr. P. in all he is made to say, but still his remarks as a whole are valuable:

"Mr. President: Sir, I am loth to let the members retire without first giving my sentiments on the subject which occupied them at the beginning of the *séance*, namely, the use of '*auxiliaries*' in the application of the science of Homœopathy. I am prepared to admit that, in the present condition of our *Materia Medica*, and the very limited sum of provings compared with the fulness of the treasury of remedial agencies which are doubtless comprised within the productions of the kingdoms of nature, we must expect to be baffled in the treatment of diseases which, bye-and-bye, when that treasury has been more diligently explored and tested, will be found to be curable: yet I cannot but say I have been painfully affected and mortified by the admissions which have been made by some of the best experienced of the present assembly of those deficiencies. Having espoused the Hahnemannian law of therapeutics these four years, after a vetustan experiment of the inglorious uncertainties of the ancient ways, I feel jealous for the maintenance and furtherance of the credit of it, and quite averse to be taking myself again to those labyrinths of tormenting dubiety, from out of which I have been guided by the happy discovery of our noble founder. At no time of my brief course of homœopathic practice have I had recourse to any description of auxiliary; what success I have had has been achieved by a faithful adherence to the doctrines of the New School, and those gifted and much-experienced practitioners by whom I was initiated have also, I believe, uniformly observed the foundation-principle of our practice.

"I grieve to contemplate the possible results of an authorization of the use of '*auxiliaries*,' so called; by the timid, by the in-

dolent, and by the imperfectly-inducted professors of Homœopathy, recourse will be taken hastily to them, and even the ambition and ardor of the more sincere and qualified for an extension and additions to our provings may be moderated, and thus our better art will be disparaged and retarded, and ultimately be debased into a mere adjunct to the ancient system of treatment that has now begun to decline, and would possibly sink into desuetude in the ratio of the rising prosperity of its honorable rival, if this were, as it should be, fostered zealously and faithfully.

"Imperfect as our resources are at present, I could not indiscriminately condemn every use of means not strictly homœopathic, though, should I be in the dilemma supposed, and be actuated according to the present impulse of my mind, I would prefer to acknowledge the perplexity, and, if no other homœopath was at hand, to give the patient the choice of transfer into the charge of a declared practitioner of the Old School. It may be urged that the main duty of the physician is to relieve or cure his patient; but then let him use only those means which he is assured will effect the one or other of those ends without the infliction of an ulterior injury on the sufferer.

"Finality and imperfection pertain to the understanding and works of man, wherefore he may often fail in the application of the truthful principles of nature; and, as respects the subject of remark, I have this consolation, Mr. Chairman, that the law of 'let like be treated with like' has neither been questioned nor falsified by those gentlemen who have here confessed to an occasional obligation to meet an urgent necessity by means not known to be referable to that law.

"I have felt constrained to advance these remarks, rather than to let the advocacy of the latitudinarian practice pass *nemine contradicente*, and without protesting against what I conceive likely to damage the integrity and progress of our medical reform."

Nearly forty physicians and surgeons, with chemists, attended the Congress, and nearly fifty practitioners sent letters of apology for their absence.

The next meeting of the Congress will be held in Manchester, August, 1853, which, from its central position, will, no doubt, attract a large gathering.

THE DINNER.

At six, the greater portion of the members of Congress, with the addition of a number of friends, among whom we noticed James Simpson, Esq., Advocate, the well-known friend of popular education, Mr. Russell, Advocate, and Mr. Stewart, of the *Edinburgh News*, assembled to dinner. The

dining-hall of the Hopetoun Rooms was elegantly fitted up, and the dinner of the most *recherché* and, at the same time, most substantial description; quite a contrast to the tawdry, gingerbread decoration and overdressed leanness of the Soyer dinner last year. Professor Henderson occupied the chair, and Dr. Black the vice-chair. A choice choir of glee-singers attended, and enlivened the proceedings by the performance of an appropriate and well-selected number of glees and madrigals.

The CHAIRMAN, who was supported on his right and left by Mr. Frith, of London, and Dr. Drysdale, of Liverpool, after having proposed the usual loyal and national toasts, rose and said: "I have now to propose what, in the social meetings of our body, has ever justly been regarded as the great toast of the evening—the 'Memory of Hahnemann.' I confess I feel no small measure of diffidence in approaching the subjects suggested by the toast, for, on mentioning the memory of Hahnemann, it is impossible not to advert, however briefly, to those great qualities and great achievements which made his name by far the most illustrious in the annals of medicine. Medicine, as you know, is partly made up of contributions from various sciences, and can claim, as exclusively its own, only the science of disease, pathology, and the science of cure, or therapeutics. These two sciences are sacred to the physician; and it is on the field of the one or the other that his peculiar fame must be sought, and his monument be reared. It may be unnecessary to remark, that both pathology and therapeutics had a being, such as it was, in all ages; but it is only of late, nearly, indeed, within the present century, that they have ceased to be almost entirely fanciful, fictitious, and groundless. The names of men deservedly famous for their genius and learning do indeed adorn the previous history of both; but I believe it is doing no injustice to them to say, that their labors in pathology and therapeutics are rather an entertainment to the antiquary, than useful or instructive to the physician. The last half century has witnessed a great change. Pathology, if it cannot boast of a single law, aspiring to explain and comprehend all the phenomena of disease, like the successive theories of former days, is yet rich in sound principles and accurate operations; and, if it has no master-mind to rule successive generations of admiring disciples, has many assiduous cultivators who constantly add to its treasures. How different is the case with the other science, as more generally believed in and practiced? It is admitted by those who do not rank among us—by the best informed of them, at least—that their therapeutics (I use their own language) 'is of all medical sciences the most unsettled and unsatisfactory in its present state, and the

least advanced in its progress.' If we can justly and gladly utter a far different judgment of our therapeutics, the memory of Samuel Hahnemann can never be mentioned among us without affectionate and admiring gratitude. And well may he be admired! When we consider the chaos of false principles and false opinion, of time-honored prejudices and erroneous convictions, that overlaid, disfigured, and concealed the *true* in therapeutics—the wisdom and sagacity, the intellectual power and daring, of the man who discovered and drew it forth, and who labored so long and so bravely to place it where it ought to be, appear altogether unequalled in the history of any science, of any country, or of any age. He stands alone as the great master of the science and art of therapeutics, and he will ever stand alone; for although much must yet be added to his researches which will make his discovery of the great law of cure more and more a blessing to mankind with every successive year, still, as the discoverer of the law, and of the principal requisites for carrying it into practical effect, Hahnemann must ever stand far apart from even the most successful of his followers—alone in his glory. We are not so solicitous to claim for Hahnemann a high place in pathology. Pathology was not his vocation; yet, if this were the proper place and time, I could prove from his writings that he had not merely glimpses, but even distinct though partial views of some of the most important truths of modern pathology long before they had caught the eyes of other men. For these reasons, and for his attainments in chemistry, so considerable for the time in which he lived, as well as for his classical lore and general learning, which would have been remarkable in a man of any period, Hahnemann, had he never discovered the great law of therapeutics, would still have been ranked as one of the most notable men of his day. We have to do only with his public, his scientific character and doings; but I cannot deny myself the pleasure of taking a single glance at his private virtues. From the lips of those who knew him personally, we hear but one voice of praise and loving admiration of the man and the friend; and his writings abound, as no other scientific writings do, with utterances of that piety and benevolence which we are assured pervaded his conversation and his conduct. While on the subject, it has occurred to me, that those who come after us will be apt to blame us, who live so near his times, if we neglect the opportunities we enjoy of collecting from those who had the honor of his friendship whatever may be worthy of being preserved regarding him; and I think it would be desirable for this or for the next Congress to devise some way by which these particulars might be gathered ere the opportunity pass away

for ever. But whatever be your decision on this point, there can be but one sentiment among us in commemorating the greatest of physicians."

The toast was drunk in solemn silence.

Dr. SUTHERLAND, on proposing the "Progress of Medical Science," said: "It is not my purpose to trace the history of that science from the days of Hippocrates. Were I to do so, I would necessarily fall back to the garden of Eden, where disease first entered the human family, and by its side arose the remedy, for no disease exists without its appropriate cure. But without detaining you in this manner, there are two points which I will just allude to. These comprise all that has been done towards the advancement of medical science. The subject of diagnosis is equally applicable to Allopathy or Homœopathy. Of this science of diagnosis, the stethoscope may be said to make up the one-half and the microscope the other half—the one is the right hand and the other the left hand of the physician. But, besides the beautifully-elaborated system of diagnosis, we have now obtained a guide in the art of healing which we had not before. That law has been enunciated by Samuel Hahnemann—a man who, notwithstanding the great benefits he has conferred on the human race, has been covered with obloquy after his death. These two points embrace all that is interesting in the subject either to the profession or the public; and I beg to give the 'Progress of Medical Science.'"

Dr. RUSSELL, in proposing the "University of Edinburgh, and their distinguished chairman, Professor Henderson," adverted in happy terms to the uses of such an institution, and the loss sustained by society in general, when, by the ignorance or mismanagement of its Directors, or the neglect of the public, any injury was done to it. He characterised the treatment of Mr. Pope, by the body of Examiners, as highly disgraceful, and calculated to inflict a deep injury on the University.

The CHAIRMAN acknowledged the toast, as follows: "I beg to thank you most sincerely for the honor you have now done to the University to which I belong, and to my name in connection with it. It would be indelicate, and it would be improper, in me to advert to several of the topics which were in their proper place alluded to by Dr. Russell. All I shall say in reference to the University is simply this, that we must learn to make much allowance for men who have been suddenly placed in unprecedented circumstances. Much may have been done which more mature reflection and experience, if it could have been possessed, would have prevented; and with this remark I dismiss the subject. With regard to myself, I have no doubt that many who have heard of our late controversies in this city, re-

garded the whole as in a great degree very much more formidable to those who were in the thickest of it than we actually felt. If the controversy had elicited nothing more than this, I for my part would rejoice that it took place, namely, that never had a controversy of the same kind taught us how strong public feeling was in all matters relating to conscience and duty. We felt strengthened by the conviction that the public of this country—whether they coincided in our peculiar opinions or not—were entirely at one with us on this point; that we should have a fair field and fair play. That they have secured to us, and as long as that is preserved, I need not assure you I shall endeavor to do my duty in the hour of trial and the hour of difficulty."

The next toast, "The Homœopathic Institutions in Great Britain," was proposed by the CHAIRMAN, accompanied with the following remarks: "We have now (he said), in almost every town where Homœopathy is established, dispensaries, and of hospitals there are two in London and one in Manchester. I will say nothing as to their management or the prosperity of their funds; but it occurs to me that I may be allowed to make a few observations on the subject, in consideration that I myself spent fifteen years of my life as hospital physician in one of these admirable institutions. It has occurred to me that size was one element in hospitals not less important to their efficiency and success—in one important particular, at least,—than good management and plenty of funds. No doubt the benefits to the poor from hospital institutions may be in some measure secured by even smaller institutions; but then this benefit is not incompatible with that liberal arrangement for clinical instruction, which can alone be afforded in large hospitals, where sound and learned practitioners can only be found. I do think it has been a great mistake on the part of our friends that they did not institute one great hospital instead of two small hospitals in London, for now, at this early stage of the development of the system, Homœopathy cannot maintain more than one great hospital. There may be more than one eventually, but for some time it will be more for the advantage of the progress of Homœopathy to have only one large hospital, to which students might resort with the hope and certainty of having in the study of their profession the means of obtaining an insight into all the varieties of disease. With this toast I couple the health of Dr. Dudgeon; and were he not connected with the metropolitan hospitals, he would still have a strong claim on a meeting of this kind. We owe him much for his labors as a journalist, and his contributions to the progress of our science. We owe him much for being the able translator of so many valuable works of our Great Master. He

has thus done great benefit to our science, by bringing our Master's doctrines within the knowledge of all, which could not have been the case, if the works had been locked up in the language of his native country."

Dr. DUDGEON returned thanks.

Mr. RUSSELL, advocate, gave the toast of "The Press." He said, that before they could have patients, and procure the enlargement and extension of their science, they must, through means of the press, inject into the public mind more fully, and with greater confidence, those colors which were to give it a tint. There was, however, some danger of the scientific literature, because of the fewness of its patrons, becoming too popular, and, on the other hand, of the popular literature becoming too scientific. Now, it was obviously of great importance that the scientific should be as scientific as possible; and the *Journal of Homœopathy* served this purpose, while they had the *Homœopathic Times*, which was of a more popular character. It was impossible to overestimate the value of such works in this controversy. He concluded by giving "The Press," coupled with the health of Mr. STEWART, of the *Edinburgh News*.

Mr. STEWART, of the *Edinburgh News*, returned thanks very briefly.

Mr. SIMPSON, advocate, being called on by the Chairman for a toast, gave "The Freedom of Opinion." Mr. Simpson delivered an eloquent speech on this important subject, and concluded by connecting with the sentiment, "The exiles for free opinion now present."

The toast was drunk with great enthusiasm, and Dr. WIELOBYCKI, of Edinburgh, returned thanks in an able speech.

Dr. FEARON proposed "Foreign Congresses."

Dr. WALKER, of Manchester, proposed the "Homœopathic Chemists," coupled with the names of the chemists present: Messrs. Walker, London; Turner, Manchester; Clifton, Northampton; and Allshorn and Brown, Edinburgh.

The health of Drs. Russell and Wielobycki, the Secretaries of the Congress, was then drunk, and the meeting separated, having previously sung the Scottish parting of "Auld Lang Syne."

ON THE OBSERVATIONS OF NATURE IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE.

BY ANDREW COMBE, M. D.

Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, one of the Physicians in Ordinary in Scotland, to the Queen, &c., &c.

In laying before our readers the letter of Dr. A. Combe to his brother, George Combe, Esq., we do not intend thereby to endorse

the views therein expressed on the effects in man of the laws of Nature in health and sickness; but it contains evidence of a strong love of truth, of great liberality of feeling, of clear perceptions of the deficiencies of the allopathic system, and important suggestions to his own school (allopathic), etc., which seems to us might be read with profit by some of our bigoted allopathic brethren of this country.

Edinburgh, 8th January, 1842.

"MY DEAR GEORGE,—The great defect in the study of medicine, and in all investigations connected with it, at present, seems to me to consist in the nearly total absence of guiding principles, and in the neglect of the great rules of Bacon, and more especially of *the observation of nature*, as the only solid foundation on which medicine or any other science can rest and advance towards perfection. This last will seem to many of my brethren a very singular charge, because if there is one circumstance on which the profession prides itself more than another at this moment, it is on the ardour with which observation is pursued and facts are sought for. Nevertheless, I believe the charge to be supported by incontrovertible evidence, and I attribute the small progress really made to this very truth. I admit that, everywhere, observations are made and facts stored up with an industry, accuracy, and zeal, which, under better guidance, would soon accomplish great things. But these observations and facts are incomplete, and therefore partial, and, if relied upon, apt to mislead. They are *phenomena or occurrences* rather than ultimate facts, and, their conditions and relations remaining unknown and unconsidered, they lead to no useful results. Hence the multitude of observations daily recorded in the writings of medical men serve more to oppress the memory and puzzle the inquiring mind, than to advance science and improve practice. Hence, too, the thousand and one facts of the one year disappear under the shade of the thousand and one newer facts of the succeeding year. *All*, indeed, are not of this description. Some few out of the many are *complete* facts, and have a meaning which becomes daily brighter, and bears a direct relation to practice. The sum of these constitutes the real amount of the progress made by medical science, and the proverbial uncertainty of medicine affords a pretty, accurate indication of the relative amount of incomplete or false facts gathered into the granary.

"The grand object of medicine is to preserve and restore the healthy action of all the different organs and functions of the human body, so as to ensure their efficiency, and fit the individual for the successful

discharge of the duties devolving upon him as a created being and a member of society. Here, then, the first step to be taken is obviously to become acquainted with the mechanism of the body, the structure of its constituent organs, the conditions or laws under which these act, the purposes which they respectively serve in the animal economy, and the relations in which they stand to each other, and to the external agents by which man is surrounded and acted upon from the moment of conception down to his latest breath. In other words, the first step towards rational principles of cure must consist in a *knowledge of the laws of the healthy functions*. The second ought to be the observation of the manner in which the various disturbing causes act upon the different functions, and the *kind, course, duration*, and termination, of the morbid action which they produce. Having investigated these points, we become qualified to inquire, in the next place, what circumstances will best favour the intentions of nature, and remove the obstacles which may have arisen to impede or thwart her efforts. To succeed in these aims, or even to make a rational attempt at succeeding, we must be profoundly impressed, or I may say *saturated*, with the great principle or truth, that all the operations and actions of the living body, whether healthy or morbid, take place according to *fixed and discoverable laws*, and that God has left nothing to chance. With this grand fact before us, it becomes palpably evident that we can do nothing rational, in the way of either prevention or cure, except in so far as we act in accordance with these laws. Many medical men have, however, a very different impression from this. A good physician will always seek to be, and never aim at being more than, Bacon's '*servant and interpreter of nature*.' A greater than he created man and ordained the laws of his being, and no surer road can be found than that traced by the hand of his Creator. Overlooking this truth, and viewing disease as an entity ungoverned by any definite laws, and not destined to run through any definite course, many medical men talk as familiarly of *their* 'curing' and 'arresting disease' as if they had an absolute control over the whole animal functions, and could alter their laws of action at pleasure. To my mind, no clearer proof of presumption and philosophic ignorance can be found than this usurpation of the prerogatives of Deity; and its results are often very unsatisfactory.

"That there are forms of disease in which a determinate nature and course cannot be easily traced, is quite true; but there *are* many more in which the natural course is as obvious as that of the sun. Take the familiar example of cow-pox, small-pox, fever, or ague. The disease is regulated by fixed laws in such a palpable manner, that every

medical book describes with perfect accuracy the appearances which each will present on given days of its progress in an average constitution. The same holds with measles, scarlatina, and many other acute affections; and less clearly, but still perceptibly enough, with gout, rheumatism, and inflammation. All of these go through a regular course, in a shorter or longer time; and when everything goes according to rule, we feel assured that the constitution is safer than where some unusual accident has interrupted the natural progress of events. This, be it observed, is the course towards health which the Creator, in constituting man, considered best for him; and the wisest thing we can do is to act in accordance with it, and seek only to remove impediments. It is not we to whom the cure is intrusted, or by whom it is effected. The Creator has perfected all the arrangements for that purpose, and our sole business ought to be to give these arrangements full play. Man, however, is too full of his own importance to view things in this light. He wishes to be master and to control disease by his own act, and accordingly he has in all ages been seeking for the means of 'arresting' disease at its onset. Not many years ago, the cold affusion was in this way in high vogue for *cutting short* fever, and its praises were loudly sounded. Gregory applied it even in scarlet fever, and I rather think in measles. In many cases nature was so far vanquished, by repeated cold drenching, that the disease was apparently cut short during the commotion, and (probably from relief being obtained through another channel) without visible bad effects. But in many more, nature stood firm, and additional mischief was added to the original evil, in the shape of affections of internal organs, which ended fatally. Now affusion is laid aside, and its legitimate substitute, tepid or cool sponging of the surface, is usefully employed, because in harmony with the natural course of events.

Here, then, is a type or standard to guide us to the correct investigation of nature in other less determinate affections. Is it not presumable that they also have a certain nature, and course, and termination, which it would be well for us to observe and promote? Take even a severe cold, with which all are acquainted more or less. Everybody knows that when once set in, treat it how you like, it will run through a determinate course of increase, maturity, and decline, and that all we can do is to shorten a little the duration of its stages by diminishing its intensity; or lengthen it by increasing its severity. Occasionally, it is true, an incipient cold may be stopped by a 'heroic' remedy, such as a tumbler of warm punch at bed-time; but much more frequently the heroes leave the patient worse than they found him, and the common experience of

mankind shrinks from their use. Even a common boil on the fingers runs through its regular stages of inflammation and decline, or of suppuration and ulceration, each stage being hastened or retarded by external or constitutional causes, but never inverted. But if we apply to the one stage the means which are adapted only to the succeeding one, the result will be injurious; or if we lower the system so much that it becomes inadequate to carry on the regular succession of actions required for recovery, mischief must once more be produced. Let us take a case of pleurisy in an individual of average strength as an example. We know that, in ordinary circumstances, the excitement goes on increasing during a period varying from two to five or six days; that effusion of fluid into the cavity of the pleura ensues, that the inflammation then begins to abate, and after a few days more passes into an inactive state; that the natural action of the part then begins to be restored, and the fluid to be absorbed, till by and by recovery is completed. Or, if the inflammation endangers life, it either goes on longer than usual, or gives rise to effusion of a quality and quantity incompatible with recovery, and death at last ensues. In a case of average severity in a healthy constitution, left simply to the quiet and abstinence which nature almost compels, we know, from observation, that such are the stages by which recovery is brought about; and all that the physician need attempt or care for is to use every precaution to prevent excitement from running too high or going on too long, and to meet any contingencies which may interfere and impede recovery.

"Very different, however, is the general course of proceeding. Relying on the testimony of an incomplete fact (*viz.*, that blood-letting produces excellent effects in inflammation, without attending sufficiently to the influence of the *adjuvantia*), the moment the practitioner ascertains the existence of 'inflammation,' he pulls out his lancet and bleeds the patient copiously. The oppressed vessels being thus partially emptied, much relief is experienced, and both patient and physician are pleased with the hope that the disease will be 'cut short.' This we shall suppose to have happened at the end of twenty-four or forty-eight hours, or first third of the *ascending* stage of the inflammation.

(To be continued.)

For the American Journal of Homœopathy.

MR. EDITOR: On looking over the 12th No. of the American Magazine a few days since, my attention was arrested by a most remarkable case of cure by goosegrease. The case is quoted from the Northwestern

Journal of Homœopathy, as seen on 381st page of the magazine. The editor of the *Northwestern Journal* seems himself unable to account for the wonderful curative effects of goosegrease in a most inveterate case of asthma which had withstood the most persevering use of all other remedies known to him. Now this whole matter is easily explained, and we may as well help the poor fellow out of his dilemma by advising him to change the name of his Journal to *Northwestern Journal, devoted to Homœopathy and Goosegreasepathy*, so as to have it in keeping with the wide-open and noisy mouthpiece of the *Western College of Homœopathic and Hydropathic Medicine at Cleveland*. Now is it not plain that by putting goosepathy at the end of goosegrease the whole matter is cleared up in such a way, as to leave no doubt upon the mind with regard to the *modus operandi* of said grease? Most certainly. This case was quoted by the editors of the *American Magazine* to show up their literary backing, and fortify themselves in their eclectic position in medical science and Therapeutics. They are welcome to all the benefit derivable from such authority or such reported causes. And they may have all the glory now by such uncalled-for *metaphysical* flagellations as that given by them to a consistent Homœopath who very modestly says, on page 357, of *Magazine*. "I am well pleased with the merry things it contains (*Magazine*), but can by no means endorse all its sentiments. I consider the LAW SIMILIA to be one of Nature's laws, and consequently it must be perfect. No remedy, then, should be recognised as a system, and if water be applied only in accordance with this law, and only when applied in this way, can it be beneficial, we have nothing more, still, than Homœopathy, pure Homœopathy. I am as much in favor of introducing new remedies into our materia medica as any one can be, but to recognise any one as a system I must forever remain opposed. How unlike the goosegrease talk—and yet the *goosegrease* Dr. is met with a smile of approbation and pride, whilst this consistent man of science and system is pitched about fore and aft, without mercy, by the champions of eclecticism, who believe in more than one law of cure; for instance, the homœopathic

kinesetherapathic; homœopathic, goosegreasepathic, and as many more as there are curative agents in nature. The editors of the *Magazine* complain that they have never had a point presented by their opponents at which they could aim before, and surely if they, in the long and windy article under the head of "*But one law of cure*," are aiming at their text, they have shown themselves bad marksmen, for they have hit everything around the text whilst it is left untouched.

I wish, Mr. Editor, to call their attention to the text, the point, by the following interrogations. Would you, Messrs. Editors of the *Magazine*, advise Mr. Editor of the *Northwestern Journal*, to change the name of his paper to *The Northwestern Journal, devoted to Homœopathy and Goosegreasepathy*? If so you may vindicate your own consistency. If not, how will you defend your *hydropathic* enterprise?

Dr. —, whose short letter appears on page 357 of the *Magazine*, says nothing about the value or uses of water; I am not aware that its uses, as an important and indispensable agent in the treatment of the sick, have been gainsaid by the pure homœopaths, or "system-mongers" as they are called by the *Magazine*, in contradistinction to true physicians, who "look with open eyes" and go through the world with "receptive souls," and only ask, when they see anything, whether it is one of "God's great truths," in order to comprehend it fully.

I hope the point will not be dodged by the editors of the *Magazine*; but met and shot at fairly, with all the intellectual artillery. Water is good for men and cattle, whether sick or well. Independently of its diluent and cleansing properties, it exerts a powerful influence over the vital economy by virtue of its temperature, compared with the temperature of the system. If its temperature corresponds to that of the system it produces no effects whatever, except by virtue of its diluent and cleansing qualities. Evaporation may and does affect the temperature of the body, but aside from these water is without effect. In view of the effects of water, temperaturepathy would rather express its mode of operation; but let Messrs. Editors vindicate their peculiar notions, and answer to the points before them. Will you, Mr. Editor, give them the

benefit of a mark to shoot at by publishing the above, and oblige

Your Obedient Servant,

D. M. DAKE, M.D.

Pittsburg, Pa., September, 1852.

WORDS TO THE WISE

There is a spirit-depth in every human being, if he will attend to it. We homœopaths have been charged with knavery or folly. But the honest among us, who have the consciousness of that spirit-depth, declare we are innocent of knavery and unconscious of folly—we declare what we believe to be true. Can our adversaries, unscrupulous though they be, say more for themselves?

This is the law of conscience, the natural law written in the heart of every human being. We declare that we are honest in our therapeutical faith, according to our convictions. Can our gainsayers say more?

It would be dishonest, criminal, homicidal, to pretend to use means for the cure of disease, which in our consciences we believed to be ineffectual. Have we not as much right to be believed as our opponents? We say we have. We lay no claim to the *a priori* argument; we rest on experiments and experience.

In one sense, small, very small indeed, is the highest intellect of the most nobly endowed of men. In one sense, all men are equal; for all are immeasurably little when compared with infinite space, and infinite space is immeasurably little when compared with the Creator.

We wish to give a moral elevation to those who profess our doctrine and practice—our *better way*, as we have called it. We are not stocks nor stones; we are not insensible to taunts and sarcasms; we have not the hide of the rhinoceros.

Those may hold it foul scorn, who know that they have enjoyed all the advantages of education that any of their opponents have done—that they may claim the distinctions of the scholar, the gentleman, and physician—that they are, notwithstanding, subjected not only to the petty annoyances of open foes, but to the misprison even of some of those who should be their warmest supporters and most devoted advocates.

During not a few years some have waged the battle of homœopathy bravely, boldly, confidently, and hopefully. They have given time, brain, intellect to their task—how have they been recompensed?

For such there are, however, solaces and hopes in their murkiest days and in their darkest nights. The nightingale, after all, is a bird with a cheerful note.

We live out our time and we pass away, but the merest word, the most simple aspiration for truth, remains for ever. Remove the Alpine range! that is a far easier task

than to expunge the most feeble sigh for truth. It reverberates through space; it excites a magnetic influence throughout the universe.

It is precisely because of their independence of party, and on account of their self-respect, and thorough independence of this or that *clique*, that some may have pleased no party. But they need not give themselves any trouble or uneasiness on this score.

"The simple believeth every word, but the prudent man looketh well to his going." This is one of the proverbs of King Solomon, and is very applicable to us homœopaths in our controversy with dominant allopathy. It must be conceded to some of us medical homœopaths of Great Britain, that we are men of good birth and breeding, of good education, and of good principles, as the world goes; some of our number have been as highly educated as any Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, it may be that a few have been even better educated. Why should such men, in good practice, with all the rewards that allopathy can afford, have adopted Homœopathy, except from conviction?

The older members of the allopathic body are suspicious of innovation; their credulity abates as they get older; they learn to lose faith in their own doctrine and practice. The younger of that body have hope and confidence; they have not yet been down-beaten by the consciousness of perpetual failure. They still believe what they have learned in the schools, and fondly fancy that the products of disease revealed by the scalpel, and called *morbid* anatomy, may be as guides to them in the treatment of disease; they are instructed to believe that the microscope may assist them in these pathological researches: but the *victim is dead*. They want the touch of Prometheus to show them *how* disease, in this or that part, began; how it made progress; how and why it terminated fatally. We take it, neither scalpel nor microscope can teach them such knowledge. They find that out after a time.

Several cases of hydrophobia have been cured by homœopathy, and one prevented, which is interesting, and so we record it. A little girl, some four or five years old, was bitten by a dog in a state of fury; whether he was rabid or not was not accurately ascertained, for he was at once shot—(this, by the way, is a very foolish practice, for if the animal is chained up, as this was, and so incapable of doing harm, it would be as well to wait and test his condition). The parents of the child, very intelligent and affectionate, strictly kept from the child all idea of any permanent effects from the bite of the furious animal. She was bitten on the *tendo Achillis*. The dear child had no idea of hydrophobia, and had no fancy about its terrors.

The wound healed: but some weeks after, red lines were observed to pass up the leg and thigh from the wound. The child had difficulty of swallowing fluids; had oppression of the chest, and thought everything she looked on was a *field of water*; was agitated, alarmed, her sleep interrupted and anxious. Under these circumstances a homœopathic physician was consulted; he gave the child *Belladonna* and *Lachesis*, in very small doses, alternate weeks.

The child gradually lost her agitation and alarm; a few months after, by the physician's advice, she went to the seaside, with directions that she should be bathed in the sea or not, as she liked it or disliked it. She did not dislike it. This occurred two years ago; the child is now quite well.

Dr. Ramsbotham's case and Mr. Leadam's have been published. Now should not such cases open the eyes of the allopathic practitioners? It is very lately that a medical man has proposed *tracheotomy*, the opening of the windpipe, for this disease, as all (allopathic) means were confessedly of no use. Why not give remedies according to the homœopathic law, good sir?

"As a good workman is known by the quantity of his chips, so may a penetrative mind by the rubbish and heaps of discarded credulity with which it is surrounded. Taking the whole world at the present moment, can it be said to believe a thousandth part of what it believed a thousand years ago?"

It is therefore we entreat our allopathic brethren to investigate our doctrine and practice. We have got rid of the rubbish and heaps of discarded credulity, and we invite them to do likewise.

We protest, at all events, against the injurious mode in which we are treated by our adversaries. They *refuse to receive proof* of the success of our practice; they entrench themselves behind the barriers of authority; they stand on prescriptive privileges; they claim a sort of divine right of doctorship in medicine.

We have no grudge against them. We know that they are sore at the success of Homœopathy. It was dead, according to them, years ago; it is now living and full of life, by their own acknowledgment. We demand as a matter of right, that our claims to be heard should be duly received and fairly sifted. We play no underhand tricks; we practise no secret practice—our doings as well as our doctrines are patent to the world. We use no mystifications; we deal in no subterfuges; we ask no favor, but we demand justice and fair-play. Let a fair trial be instituted, and let it be shown which party is most *credulous*, the allopathic or homœopathic.

With respect to the integrity of our practitioners, we suppose that, taking them as a class, they are as respectable as our opponents.—*Hom. Times.*

HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT versus ALLOPATHIC.

(Communicated by Dr. HASTINGS,
Cheltenham.)

Some things *gain* by *comparison*, others lose. The following will speak for itself, and ought to convey a useful lesson to septicies.

In the *Medical Times* (edited by that champion of allopathic treatment, of which the following is a specimen—Dr. Bushnan) of last Saturday, at page 262, the following case is reported:—

"There is at present under the care of Mr. Lloyd an old man, by trade a carpenter, in whom, while in perfect health, the bursa in front of the left patella suddenly became enlarged. It was unattended by pain, but as it interfered with his occupation, by preventing him from kneeling, he at once applied for surgical advice. The gentleman whom he consulted passed through the tumour a single thin ligature thread, and allowed him to walk home. The inflammatory process commenced almost immediately, and the rest of the day and the following day were passed in what he described as the most intense suffering. The next morning he applied for admission into the Hospital, the seton was, at once, withdrawn, and the *large abscess which it had occasioned was laid open.** During the following week he progressed satisfactorily, when all at once *another attack of inflammation* took place, the *thigh and leg became much swollen*, and a *large collection of matter* was formed around the *whole front aspect of the joint*, which was attended with great local pain, and *very serious constitutional disturbance*. The second abscess has also been opened; the swelling is now much subsided and he appears likely to recover favorably, after having been, however, *for some days placed in a critical position.*"

So much, then, for *legitimate* practice; now for a bit of rational practice, just for sake of contrast.

"Mrs. G—, aged 50, applied to me on the 8th ult., on account of a bursa, which had formed over the interior portion of the left patella. It gave her no pain, and only attracted her attention by its size, which was about that of a walnut; when I saw it, I prescribed *Puls.* and *Calc. c.*, an eight days' course of each, intermitting a few days between them. In three weeks the bursa was completely gone."

Let the public "look upon this picture and then upon that." The seton practice of the allopath had nearly finished the poor carpenter, and there is a great probability that the poor man will be dismissed the hospital "the shadow of his former self,"

* The italics are mine, as I deem such legitimate practice worthy the attention of allopaths.

with an ankylosed or stiff knee; rendered incapable of ever again using it.

Had a homœopathist made such a mess of his patient's knee as these legalized allopaths did, the immaculate *Lancet*—though stained with blood—would have sung out for an action for damages. But whatever cruelties their blood-stained proceedings may effect, and whatever dead they may lay prostrate, they are quietly chronicled as every-day occurrences. But only let an unfortunate homœopathist act thus, and they thunder in his ears the terrors of "Mala Praxis," and even when he cures his patients by *gentle and rational* means, they call him quack, and shout humbuggery. Which of the two, think you, gentle reader, is the greater quack? The man with the seton needle, making an opening in his patient's knee, causing inflammation and abscesses, which have to be opened by the lancet of the hospital surgeon, and thus placing the life of his patient in imminent peril—"a critical position," truly—or the homœopathist with no other instrument but the tiny though potent medicinal globule, curing his patient in a prompt and gentle manner.

"Comparisons," they say, "are odious," every allopath who reads the above will say so; and, I think, if there is one thing more than another calculated to exhibit their practice in its true and real bearing, it would be a faithful narration of the *treatment* of cases under their care, contrasted with similar cases under homœopathic treatment. This would indeed be holding the mirror up to nature. What a fruitful theme for the graphic and life-speaking pen and pencil of Mr. Punch! Only fancy him sketching a sick man in one room, surrounded by dozens of pill-boxes, bottles, blisters, etc., reduced to a mere skeleton, leaning on his emaciated elbow, and, with rueful face, swallowing his prescribed nauseous compound, and in another room depicting a patient, sitting up in his bed, taking, with a cheerful look, the tiny globule, no pills, bottles, or blisters in sight.

How many years will it take to realize this idea? But I must conclude, as my readers may perhaps think that I am moving in an eccentric orbit and about to fly off at a tangent. Well, be it so. The world itself moves thus, and if I assume the tangent shape, it is only to give those *behind and before* me a peep at allopathy.—*Hom. Times.*

Sept. 14, 1852.

CLAIRVOYANCE.

On the subject of the application of Clairvoyance to the prescription of the remedy for disease, we would wish to offer a few remarks. Of later years it has been the practice of many persons, even among the

intelligent, to apply to clairvoyants to examine their condition and prescribe for their infirmities. This must certainly be done without reflection upon or examination into the subject. We will admit, for the sake of argument, the fact of clairvoyance, and will also admit that they may even, with accuracy if you choose, describe the anatomical appearance of the diseased part, or effects to the eye on the organ most afflicted, such as it would present if we could see through the matter that surrounds it; but even with all this admitted we are met with this difficulty when we proceed farther, and suppose that they can prescribe.

In prescription two things are necessary: 1st. A knowledge of the cause that probably produced the appearances witnessed, and 2d, what is essential to the homœopath, a knowledge of the remedy that will effect a cure or re-establishment of the normal condition of the patient. It has generally been admitted by the advocates of *mesmerism* that its effects are produced by some natural law, though at present but ill understood. Now, to suppose that persons under its influence can see the appearance of disease we have as above admitted. That may be the natural consequence of their condition, as it is said; but to suppose that they can prescribe is giving to *mesmerism* not a natural but a *miraculous effect*. For can it be that the mere act of man making a few passes over another can at once endow him with a knowledge which neither possesses? and that the cause of disease and curative effect of remedies, indeed the whole *arcana* of medicinal science, should be at once open to his view? This supposition is so absurd that even argument could not defeat it; and yet how can it be avoided? It cannot be claimed that inspiration can be produced by one human being acting on another. That can only proceed from God himself. It cannot be claimed that the knowledge of countless facts bearing upon the causes that produce the diseased appearance, that have been acquired by the minds of many men attentively watching the phenomena of disease, and handed down from generation to generation, thus slowly accumulated after great labor and research, can on the instant spring into the mind by these passes. Nor can it be claimed, however enlightened or

exalted the ratioeination of the subject of these passes, that also a knowledge of the curative action of remedies, with all their numberless effects, can thus be produced. Since such is the dilemma we are led into, we must adopt the absurdity, or suppose if cures have been effected by them they have been the result of the action of the patient's mind on their disease, or one of those happy *guesses* that may hit, and by jumping all facts and reasons, light upon the result by a blind chance. It would be out of the rule of nature were it otherwise.

[For the American Journal of Homœopathy.]

EUTHANASIA.

Intraetable cases of disease occur in the practice of secessionists from the antiquarian farrago method, in which there are some inducements suggesting the propriety of returning to the quasi-rudiments. Perhaps one mistake that is made, is the neglect to acknowledge a fact—that we must have death. A physician cannot expect to continue a busy practice with no fatal cases. He has only to settle the matter in his mind as to in what way disease can be most successfully treated, with the production of the fewest factitious symptoms, and the greatest conservation concerning the strength of the patient. But perhaps the undeviating confidence in the new mode is sometimes temporarily substituted by a return to Allopathy, from the weighty considerations of sympathy with the patient—convincing friends of ability or loyalty to reputation, the comparative inception of Homœopathia as a science, and its previous trial in the case. It seems only time for a man to particularize himself with a sect when he has become satisfied of the superior practicability of the principles. If a man secedes he tells the world he was attracted by the greater possessions of the second love. If he reverses, the public should mark him and withdraw their confidence. If not a dishonest man he is equally dangerous to be employed if the fear of death and other unweighty inducements drift him about like a cork.

A man is a quack that is ready to “try it” in extreme cases, that introduces strangers, places bars for their friends, though perhaps anything but a gratified experiment

with the vitality of the patient, struggling and ready to go down.

A physician cannot positively say any more than a layman most ignorant of medical subjects, whether Homœopathia has done all it can or will do in an animatory case. Where death is expected from hour to hour, and day to day, the physician cannot say that now is the moment, positively, when hope in Homœopathia ended, and was strengthened by submitting to the wishes of some enthusiastic old woman, with confidence in her medical skill according to the size of her family.

In certain cases, the physician, as well as the anxious mother, believes there is hope as long as there's life. It is too often forgotten, however, by both parties, that the hope should be greater just in proportion as the entire charge of the patient is given to one who has become acquainted with the constitution.

In a medical point of view, this susceptible, rare practice, such hopeless versatility, is doing battle against our system, and unless it cease altogether, it will need preserving from its friends.

I am aware that in many instances patients are *allowed* to take almost any medicine that shall please the friends, because the physician believes that it will make very little difference what they do take. But is it not better that the physician retain his position and continue his advocacy of his profession? The patient will die as easy as if all its cousins had a shot at him. I believe, gentlemen of the profession, that this succumbing to consanguineous ignoramus in severe, hopeless cases of disease, is a most unheard-of method of proselyting, of introducing a new system of medical practice to the world. From this very same cause, I believe, persons have sometimes said to me, “Doctor, do you not try something else in *severe* cases, where Homœopathia has previously been employed?” As though you had been trying the new system in the incipient stages of the disease merely for effect, a kind of practical recommendation, but really did not rely upon it or believe it was effective. I generally inform such specimens of the Yankee element that I am in favor of an easy death.

New York, Oct. 13, 1852.

C. B.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER, 1852.

NO. 7.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE.

HYOSCYAMUS.

In *Hyos.*, erotic hallucinations are frequent, and a jealous feeling is connected therewith.

Case. P—, a woman, twenty-five years of age, of a quiet, peaceable temper, after violent mental emotions had epileptic fits; subsequently she had, on the fifth day of her second confinement, several fits of a like character. On the 5th September she fell into a state of hallucination, and up to the 13th of the same month was treated allopathically without result.

In her violent paroxysms of rage she abused those around her, and tore whatever was near her; she evinced great solicitude; at intervals sung, whistled, laughed, manifested a fondness for kissing; pretended to be pregnant, to be in labour, etc.

Bell. 30, merely excited her, without effecting a cure. *Hyos.* diminished the violence. *Verat.* 12, on the 15th, produced sleep, and she became tranquil. From the 16th of April to the 16th of May, she took *Verat.*, *Acon.*, *Helleb.*, *Bell.*, *Stram.*, without permanent relief. At present, the following are the

Symptoms.—She is extremely excited; raves when her wishes are opposed; she abuses and strikes every one indiscriminately; she is talkative; talks irrationally; weeping alternates with a gladsome humour; anxiety, with trembling of the limbs; this is accompanied by an abundant secretion of milk.

After a repetition of the *Hyos.* all the symptoms were suddenly arrested; her health returned, and she continues well.—*Annal.* 1, 67.

Case XL. A woman, thirty-seven years of age, addicted to drinking, fell into a state of mania.

Symptoms.—Face red, hot; wild looks; breathing quick, irregular; is abusive; continually escaping from the house; tears her clothes; runs about the room at night; strikes violently at all around her, and is with difficulty quieted; will neither eat nor

drink. *Hyos.* 2, one drop, cured her in twenty-four hours.

IGNATIA.

General Observation.—*Ignatia* will seldom or never affect a cure in a state of mind neither disposed to be frightened nor vexed.—*Organon*, *Hahn.*

Particular Cases.—*Case.* A modest young woman, twenty years of age, after her monthly indisposition, evinced signs of insanity, lost at length all consciousness, and constantly indulges in unmixed, fixed ideas.

Symptoms.—She fancies herself married, and that she is pregnant; is tortured through stings of conscience at imaginary crimes; strives constantly to make her escape to drown herself. In consequence of pressure of blood to the head and heart, she suffers as if from the anguish of death. She is wholly at rest only when she can lie down, perfectly unmolested, indulging her ideas, and expressing the same incessantly in a complaining tone; if she be therein disturbed, she screams out, strikes, and tears whatever she lays hold of, whilst she continually cries that "she neglects her duty, breaks her oath;" face distorted and cadaverous; craving for acids. It is difficult to induce her to eat, and when she has eaten, her conscience suffers an additional sting for having indulged.

Several remedies, *Bell.*, *Hyos.*, *Stram.*, *Aur.*, *Plat.*, *Verat.*, had no effect; after *Gratiola* there was some remission. Then there set in paroxysms of rage; she was scarcely to be restrained, which state again subsided, and gave place to her former fixed ideas.

Through the use of *Ignatia*, continued for several weeks in the first, afterwards in the sixth, and at length in the ninth potency, she was perfectly restored. The menses, which were absent during her illness, again returned.—*Arch.* 15, 3, 30, and *Arch.* 16, 2, 100, *Gross.*

Case. A girl, nineteen years of age, of a strong, robust body, and sanguine temperament, fell into a spasmodic state of laughing and crying, which subsequently passed into

a state of delirium, returning by paroxysms. *Symptoms*.—She knows not those standing around her; talks to objects as though present to her fancy by strange names; supposes she is standing on a fearful height, and that she cannot come down again.

Two doses of *Stran.* 9, then *Ignatia* 8, restored her.—*Allg. H. Ztg.* 17, 376, *Gr.*

Case. A lad, twenty years of age, of a sanguine-choleric temperament, of an active fancy, in other respects strong, well-fed, suffered undeservedly a bitter mortification, after which he fell into a gastric fever, and subsequently into low spirits.

Symptoms.—Head heavy; extreme weakness of the memory; forgets everything, even to dreams; hears with difficulty; sees as through a mist; sits still, immovably fixed, constantly thinking on the mortification he has suffered, during which he knows nothing whatever of what occurs around him; likes to be alone; his thoughts of the annoyance he has suffered prevent sleep till late; sleeps restlessly, with starting in fright, and many dreams; pain in the left hypochondrium (region of spleen), increased by pressure and long walking. The hair falls out in great quantity; face earth-colored, sunken; voice tremulous, weak, with distortion of the facial muscles; does not like to speak; no desire for eating and drinking; immediately he begins to eat he is satisfied and feels full; always cold, particularly in the evening; very weak and faint; walks tottering and cautiously; evacuations from the bowels and bladder increased.

Ignat. 12, one dose, perfectly cured him within fourteen days, after the dose, for the length of five days, a visible deterioration of the entire state preceded the cure.—*Arch.* 10, 3, 104, *Attom.*

Case. A girl, twenty years of age, of a sanguine temperament, unrestrained in joy and pain, fell into a state of melancholy after suppression of the menses.

Symptoms.—Indifferent to everything that was once most dear to her; sits still by herself and weeps; fancies to herself one thing and another, particularly that she would be sick in mind; in all parts she complains of a tickling sensation, as if asleep; the epigastrium seems to her as it were void of feeling; sleep dreamy, unrefreshing; menstruation absent for the last two months.

Ignat. 2., repeated daily, cured her after several weeks.—*Arch.* 19, 1, 56, *Gross.*

Case. A girl, seventeen years of age, rather weakly, after a *fright* began to suffer spasms and insanity; fourteen days' allopathic treatment had no result.

Symptoms.—She fancies to herself that she cannot be happy, and weeps much; got

sometimes into a sort of frenzy, wherein she tears her clothes, and can scarcely be restrained by four strong persons.

Ignat. 6 daily, one dose, cured her after six days.—*Arch.* 19, 3, 33, *Griess.*

Case L. A woman of forty years of age, suffered twice daily from the following, in *paroxysms*.

Symptoms.—Anxiety, restlessness, as if she had done something wicked, or as if she had done something which led her to expect some great misfortune; she demeans herself in such a way that she can with difficulty be kept from weeping; with this the respiration is constrained, as though it were from the stomach into the neck; faintness; incapable of work; shyness; the paroxysms often last for one hour long; evacuations from the bowels indolent, insufficient; if wanting, so much the worse.

Prescription.—*Ignat.* first trituration (2-100), ten grains, dissolved in four ounces of water; a dose five times in twenty-four hours. The paroxysm came merely once on the second and third day, then it disappeared altogether, and she recovered perfectly.—*Schmid. H. A. and G.*, 126.

Retrospect.—*Ignatia* unmistakably is the proper medicine in disturbance of the mind, when individual conceptions have become fixed ideas. The patients dwell, if one disturbs them not in their ideas, partly regarding themselves, partly on matters extraneously to themselves, and they fall into a more depressed state, which may pass into exaltation, if they are disturbed therein.

The *doses* were commonly the lower potencies, and were oftentimes repeated.

The relation of *Ignatia* to the organ of *consciousness* and of *self-esteem* is unmistakably expressed in the observations.

LACHESIS.

Case. A young man had become sick in mind by too intense study.

Symptoms.—Extraordinary loquacity, not at all corresponding to his temperament; holds uncommon discourses in the most select terms, but springs rapidly from one subject to another, and treats of the most heterogeneous subjects. With this he is proud and distrustful to those around him. *Lachesis* 30, soon cured him.—*Arch.* 14, 1, 7, *Gross.*

To the Editor of the Northampton Mercury.

SIR,—To combat all the abuse of Homœopathy by writers who evidently know nothing about the system they are attacking, would occupy too much of your space and my time without doing the slightest good. It is, however, rather curious that your cor-

respondent, Common Sense, should, by way of proving the absurdity of the homœopathic principle, give us an illustration that supports it. He says, "With burns, unfortunate experience in my own family has taught me that *cooling* things are best, and not turpentine, etc. A mixture of lime-water and oil is so cooling and soothing, that I am sure no one who has ever tried it will ever use anything else." Now, both lime-water and oil are extremely inflammable substances; they are both full of caloric or heat, and consequently, the admission that your correspondent makes is an affirmation of Dr. Hahnemann's great principle *similia similibus*. Both your correspondents confound the effect of the application of certain substances with the substances themselves. A bottle of boiling water placed in a linen bag and hung up in the sun, and kept constantly wet with the strongest spirits, will become cold sooner than by any other means. Here we have the heat of the sun and the heat of the spirits extracting the heat from the water; that it is the extreme degree of cold, produced by the more rapid evaporation of spirits than of any other fluid, that extracts the heat from boiling water does not interfere with the principle *similia similibus*. As to Common Sense's remarks in reference to snow being the best application to frozen limbs, it reminds me of the Brahmin who, upon being shown the impurity of the Ganges water by some being placed in a microscope, exclaimed, "You mistake the matter; it is not your glass that shows the impurity of the sacred Ganges, but the purity of that sacred water which shows the impurity in your glass!" Everybody knows that to restore vitality to a frozen limb you must produce warmth in it. The question is, what is the best method of producing that warmth? and universal experience teaches us that it must be produced by the application of snow, and not by any warm substance. Your correspondent will not, I presume, affirm that friction with spirits or oil, or warm water, would have the same beneficial effect as friction with snow. Really, Sir, it is melancholy to see *prejudice* carrying men to such an extent as to try to write down a system of which they evidently know nothing, by using arguments and illustrations which, not having well considered, only confirm the system they wish to crush.

But we must leave such writers to themselves, and, with your permission, I will state the opinions of those who have followed the *far more dignified* course of testing the truth of Dr. Hahnemann's great principle of the healing art *before* writing upon the subject. Dr. Henderson, Professor of Pathology in the University of Edinburgh, in a letter which he addressed to Dr. Forbes, in reply to an article of his in the *British and Foreign Medical Review*, and which let-

ter is published, together with some more valuable papers by Dr. Russell, in his work entitled "Homœopathy in 1851," makes the following statement:—"The members of the Homœopathic Society of Vienna have begun to subject the *Materia Medica* of Hahnemann to a rigid experimental scrutiny, and as their mode of proceeding is worthy of being followed as an example, I transcribe this short account of it, and its bearings on the credibility of Hahnemann. "The members meet, and to each is given a portion of the medicine to be experimented with, without telling him what that medicine is. At home they take this medicine in various doses, and write down all the effects they have produced; they then meet again, and each reads over the symptoms it has produced on him. Thus there is obtained a series of testimonies from well-qualified and independent observers. They have found that the general result of Hahnemann's provings are perfectly accurate, and have expressed their admiration of his skill as an experimental and faithful describer of his experiments." (Exposition de la Doctrine Médicale Homœopathique, 2d edition, Paris, 1834.)" Your correspondents who so ridicule the homœopathic principle, *similia similibus curantur* (like enres like), are not, I presume, aware that, although Dr. Hahnemann determined the method by which the principle might be carried out with practical effect, he does not lay claim to the merit of being the discoverer of it, but quotes it from the works of Dr. Stahl, an eminent physician of the old school, who practised at Halle in 1694, and who thus writes:—"The rule admitted in medicine, to treat diseases by remedies contrary or opposite to the effects which they produce is completely false and absurd. I am persuaded, on the contrary, that diseases yield to agents which produce a similar disorder (*similia similibus*)." This passage from Stahl is quoted by Dr. Hahnemann in his great work "Organon." Here we find an eminent physician of the allopathic school, who was in 1687 physician to the Duke of Weimar, in 1694 was appointed to the professorship of medicine, anatomy and chemistry, in the University of Halle, and in 1716 became physician to the King of Prussia, asserting the *absurdity* of the system of medicine so earnestly contended for by M. R. C. S., Faust, Common Sense, and many others, and asserting the soundness of the homœopathic principle, so ridiculed by these writers, upwards of eighty years before Hahnemann thought of them. I could bring forward much more in support of Homœopathy, and I shall, with your permission, return to the subject again, because, I repeat it, the cause of Homœopathy is the cause of humanity, but I must for the present conclude. Your correspondents will, I hope, pardon me for saying that true wisdom never indulges in abuse and ridicule of a science

which attracted the attention of such men as Stahl and Hahnemann, and many other equally eminent men of later date; and although they may differ in opinion from them—and discussion is the best method of finding out truth—yet, in the language of Dr. Henderson, “the contest may be conducted as it becometh gentlemen to contend, without rash imputation of unworthy motives—without appealing to the prejudices and passions of the ignorant—without wilful unfairness and without discourtesy.” (Russell’s Homœopathy in 1851, p. 82.)

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
A. M.P.

AN ESSAY ON HOMŒOPATHIC STATISTICS.

BY JOHN OZANNE, M.D.

DR. OZANNE has contributed a series of some twenty-five papers to the Homœopathic Times, under the above title. These papers are ably written and cannot but convince the impartial reader of the superiority of homœopathic practice. The following is from the Times of the 16th ult.

We now have to discuss a question of vital importance to Homœopathy, in the present stage of its progress. It is this—*What is the mortality in pneumonia entirely left to nature?* or, in other words, *how far is pneumonia curable by dietetic measures alone?*

The solution of this question may not appear to many of our readers to be a necessary part of our inquiry into the statistics of Homœopathy. They may perhaps think it superfluous, and look upon it as prolonging unnecessarily this series of papers to an unwarrantable length; we, however, beg leave to differ from them, and to declare that we cannot arrive at a satisfactory conclusion in our Essay on Homœopathic Statistics, without giving to the solution of the question our most careful attention. The following extracts from Dr. Forbes’s well-known article on “Homœopathy, Allopathy, and Young Physic,” in the *British and Foreign Medical Review* for January, 1846, will, we trust, justify this proceeding.

After giving some account of the results obtained by Dr. Fleischmann, at the Homœopathic Hospital in Vienna, Dr. Forbes remarks:—

“What, then, it will naturally be asked, is the explanation of the momentous fact we have announced, that a considerable number of diseases have been and perhaps continue to be treated as successfully by homœopaths as by allopaths? *Is it that the one kind of treatment is as good as the other?* Is it that HOMŒOPATHY IS TRUE?” (p. 250.)

Dr. Forbes says that he gives to both these queries an unequivocal and decided negative. A little further on he tells us on what conditions he would consent *not* to reject Homœopathy. They are as follows:—

“In a case so extraordinary, so marvellous, it may be said, as that of Homœopathy, nothing short of the most positive and demonstrative evidence of its curative powers can be accepted; nothing, in short, will suffice but the *experimentum crucis* of a comparative trial, on the large scale, of its powers, on the one hand, and of *nature’s* powers on the other. Until it can be proved by clinical experience on an extended field, and on two parallel groups of similar diseases, that Homœopathy cures better than nature, we are warranted by every principle of philosophy not merely in doubting, but in denying its truth” (p. 251).

And in the following page:—

“But such being our estimate of the character and powers of Homœopathy, on what principle can we explain the fact, above admitted, that diseases have been cured and continue to be cured alike under its ministration and under that of ordinary practice? *Is it that ALLOPATHY is false also? or is it that, to obtain an explanation of the fact, we must pass by both, and fix on some THIRD POWER coincident with both, yet belonging to neither?*

“We cannot give to these queries, as to the former, either a simple negative or simple positive reply. In answer to the first, we would say that Allopathy is certainly *true*, in a limited sense, that is to say, it unquestionably possesses, to a certain extent, the power of curing diseases. It is, however, *not true* in an absolute sense, or in a sense in which it is regarded by some, inasmuch as it does not cure a great proportion of the diseases it is supposed to cure. In answer to the second, we admit that there is a third power, common to or coincident with both, which, while it explains all the triumphs of Homœopathy, reduces those of Allopathy within much narrower limits than its more zealous votaries are wont to assign it: *this is the POWER OF NATURE.*”

These extracts fully show us what obstacle we have to remove, before we can expect from the profession that degree of attention to the results of homœopathic practice which their character requires. That before its removal no real advance can be made by Homœopathy in the estimation of medical men we fully believe, and hence we think it right to endeavor to remove it, by means of the facts which the researches of the allopathic school of Vienna have brought within our reach.

The question now arises, how are we to proceed in order to treat the subject in the

way best suited to the tastes or prejudices of physicians of the present day? Owing to a circumstance arising from the publication of Dr. Forbes's article on Homœopathy, we find no difficulty, with reference to this question, in deciding upon the best course to be pursued.

Subsequently to the publication of his article, Dr. Forbes thought it advisable to open, in his Review, a section for the Natural History of Disease. At the same time he invited his readers to supply him with their observations upon this subject, and upon Homœopathy. Accordingly, several communications, bearing more or less upon them, were inserted. Among these we select a letter of Dr. Symonds, consulting physician to the General Hospital of Bristol, as our guide; both because it emanates from a man of ability, well known to the profession as the contributor of several articles to periodical and other medical works, and because we feel convinced that Dr. Symonds' remarks are exactly those which would be made by others of the most advanced in the allopathic portion of the profession.

Dr. Symonds does not feel disposed to grant so great a share in the cure of diseases to nature, and so small a one to art, as Dr. Forbes. "The question before us," says he, "is, whether it is safer to leave diseases to their own course, or to interpose what we call remedies? And really this is a very frightful question to be asking at the present date of the world's history, when medicine has been proposed as an art two thousand years and more! What! is it a probability admitting of debate, that of the countless swarms of ghosts that have passed 'the melancholy flood,' medicine has introduced to the 'grim ferryman' those whom kind Nature would have held back? But we need not frighten the imagination with horrible surmises of forthcoming corollaries from a possible conclusion, which, if it were true, would be one of the mournfullest truths in the universe" (p. 558).*

A few lines lower down, he says: "Now, it would be contrary to all other experience under the sun, if it should be discovered that men of genius and patient observation have for two thousand years been watching a certain set of phenomena, with a view to altering them and making them serve their purposes, and have tried a number of experiments to that effect, and yet have accomplished nothing or next to nothing!"

Certainly we must admit that there is some improbability in the fact, if its *antecedent probability* alone be considered. But in scientific questions, we ought never to

judge on *a priori* grounds of facts which are within the reach of experiment or observation. Yet such is the manner in which these questions are dealt with by physicians in the nineteenth century! But let us quote further from Dr. Symonds.

"It has been urged by one very estimable writer, that Homœopathy ought to have a fair experimental trial, and that it is unjust to reject the system on *a priori* evidence. But to this I would answer, that life is not long enough for making experiments, unless they are suggested by some antecedent probability. Because a dreamer or dupe tells us that he has a method for extracting sunbeams from cucumbers, are we, in order to show our freedom from prejudice, to waste precious time in putting his non-sensical process to the proof?" (p. 564.)

Therefore, on account of the want of *antecedent probability* that physicians have gone wrong for two thousand years, and because there is no *antecedent probability*, in the eyes of allopathists, that Homœopathy is true, these gentlemen will not consent to have recourse to experiment or observation; because, forsooth, precious time would be wasted in order to put non-sensical processes to the proof!

We thus find that our task will consist in the attempt to solve the following questions:—

1. Is there any *antecedent probability* that the traditional treatment of pneumonia, since the time of Hippocrates, has been based upon sound, scientific grounds, and is there any *antecedent improbability* that this treatment is either useless or injurious?

2. Are the traditional treatment of pneumonia and the treatment usually adopted in the present day, and more especially *blood-letting*, consistent with the present state of our knowledge of the pathology of pneumonia? or, in other words, is the usual treatment, and more particularly blood-letting, indispensable or even justifiable on the "*principles of rational medicine*?"

3. Is the usual treatment of pneumonia, and more especially the practice of venesection, found, by experiment and observation, to yield better results than those obtained by leaving this disease to the sole power of nature?

4. What is the influence of this treatment on the symptoms and duration of pneumonia, and upon the mode of its termination?

One more quotation from Dr. Symonds before we dismiss him, in order to proceed with our task.

Like many others, Dr. Symonds thinks that if medicine were generally practised in accordance with the dictates of the best authorities, the results of practice would be such as to leave no further desideratum to the allopathist:—

* British and Foreign Medical Review for October, 1846.

"Were pathology pursued and applied, and the operation of remedies observed and made use of, after the methods and rules laid down and illustrated by Dr. Williams, in his 'Principles of Medicine,' and by Dr. Watson, in his 'Lectures on Practice,' (I instance these works as *typical* in their respective departments), both the profession and the laity would have practical proofs of improvement in our art, sufficient, I think, to satisfy them that knowledge has been sought in the right tracks." (p. 563.)

We likewise feel disposed to offer our tribute of praise on both of these works, which deserve, in every respect to be considered as *standard* authorities in allopathic medicine. We have quoted Dr. Symonds in support of our estimation of them, because we have selected them as the best specimens of what can be said both on the *theory* and on the *practice* of medicine at the present time, on the *allopathic* side, and as the subjects of our remarks in all that concerns allopathy. We ought to add, that Dr. Williams deserves our especial attention, because he has appeared before the world—not the profession only*—as an antagonist of Homœopathy, and as the champion of the medicine founded on the so-called "*rational principles*."

I. Is there any *antecedent probability* that the traditional treatment of pneumonia, since the time of Hippocrates, has been based upon sound scientific grounds, and is there any *antecedent improbability* that this treatment is either useless or injurious?

This question would be deserving of considerable developments, if this were the place for entering into the complete solution of it. We cannot, however, do more at present than give it a very brief notice.

There are two modes of viewing it: the first, from the point of view of empirical medicine; the second, from that of "*rational medicine*." Of course, in our remarks we allude chiefly to the use of blood-letting, which is, if we take the evidence of the history of medicine, very ancient indeed; mercury and antimony are comparatively recent discoveries.

We know nothing of the reasons which led the empirics first to bleed in pneumonia. It is probable, however, that their practice in this respect was an imitation of that of others who bled upon theoretical grounds, whose guides were the "*rational principles*" of their times.

But once admitted that the empirics had bled, it is easy to understand why they should continue to employ venesection, quite irrespectively of the ultimate results

of the practice. For we may look upon it as a fact established by observation, and of which we, as homœopaths, are fully aware, that a copious blood-letting usually relieves a patient affected with pneumonia, especially if practised in the early period of the development of the disease. This fact has been recently, and by comparison with *pneumonia left to nature*, more fully established by Dietl, of Vienna, in his work on "Blood-letting in Pneumonia."

In his eighteenth aphorism he says:—

"No other means can relieve the pneumonic difficulty of breathing in the same degree as venesection."

And in the twenty-fifth:—

"The frequency of the pulse decreases by venesection, even whilst the blood is flowing, as it is well known."

Thus we may look upon it as an established fact, that whatever may be the ultimate results of this mode of treatment, blood-letting usually relieves the patient: hence a reason why blood-letting may have been and probably always has been resorted to, since its effects, supposed to be beneficial, were first observed.

A new series of experiments was requisite, in order to decide whether the relief was anything more than temporary, and whether it was on the whole beneficial or otherwise. Dietl has undertaken experiments with this view, as we shall see in our next paper.

We cannot, therefore, look upon the practice of the empirics in medicine as at all calculated to establish an *antecedent presumption* in favor of their mode of practice, unless, at the same time, another series of patients left entirely to nature could be found, with which to establish a careful comparison.

We now come to the theorists, dogmatists, or whatever else we may call them.

There is a strong reason why we cannot admit their practice to have been grounded on what are called, in the present day, "*the rational principles*" of medicine.

The reason is the following: physiology and pathology, the groundworks of rational medicine, are entirely the creation of modern times. Indeed, we can scarcely look upon them as half a century old. Nay, more; the very theories upon which Dr. C. B. Williams, the great advocate of rational principles, bases his treatment of inflammation are scarcely fifteen or twenty years old, as we shall see in our next paper. Did rational medicine not exist before that time, or, if it did, was it not based upon erroneous doctrines? Yet, if so, in what does the treatment of the present day in pneumonia so far differ from that of Hippocrates and his school and that of Galen? Did not Hippocrates or his followers bleed to incipient *deliquium animi*, as it is now done? Did not Galen often bleed twice in one day, as

* At the Brighton meeting of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association, in 1851, resolutions against Homœopathy were adopted. The eighth resolution decreed the insertion of the Report not only in the medical periodicals, but likewise in *The Times*, *Morning Post*, etc.

it is now done? Did he not draw as much as fifty ounces of blood at one bleeding, as it is now done?

We cannot, therefore, admit the authority of tradition as sufficient to prevent us from having recourse to EXPERIMENT and OBSERVATION as the true tests of our knowledge in practical medicine.

(To be continued).

THE CHOLERA AT POSEN—HOMŒOPATHIC PROPHYLACTICS.

The following extract, from an account in the *Hamburger Correspondent* of 24th September, of the cholera epidemic at Posen, dated Posen, 20th September, testifies to the good effects of homœopathic prophylactics in the cholera, which has so lately devastated that city. "Of the so-called preventives, the homœopathic have gained great credit. There was much demand for them in both our homœopathic pharmacies. People praise their good effects.

HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL CONVENTION.

A Convention of Homœopathic Physicians of Washington, Warren and Saratoga counties, was held at the Fort Edward House, in village of Fort Edward, on Saturday the 16th inst., pursuant to a circular call. After some preliminary conversation, Dr. Woleott, of Whitehall, was called to the chair, and the Convention organized by the appointment of Dr. Cole, of Easton, chairman, and Dr. Perkins, of Waterford, secretary.

The Convention then resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the adoption of a Constitution, and a Medical Association was instituted for mutual improvement and furtherance, under the name of the "Homœopathic Medical Society of Washington and Saratoga Counties."

The Society is to be open to all Physicians who acknowledge *Similia Similibus Curantur* as the *only known law* to cure, after a favorable report from a Board of Censors.

A Constitution was adopted, and the following gentlemen were chosen officers for the ensuing year.

President, Dr. B. F. Cornell, Moreau Station; *Vice-President*, Dr. E. B. Cole, Easton; *Secretary*, S. G. Perkins, Waterford; *Treasurer*, W. G. Woleott, Whitehall; *Censors*, Z. Clements, Victoryville; D. J. Easton, Saratoga Springs; W. G. Waleott, Whitehall.

The remaining time of the Convention was consumed in reports of interesting cases of disease, and of the action of remedies, both pathogenetic and curative, wherein all the members partook.

A resolution was passed, inviting publishers of newspapers in the vicinity to in-

sert the proceedings, and the Convention adjourned to the Annual Meeting at Saratoga Springs, on the 3d Wednesday of June, 1853.

L. G. PERKINS, *Sec'y.*

THE HOMŒOPATHIC AND ALLOPATHIC PRACTICE IN ACUTE PNEUMONIA CONTRASTED.

By GEORGE DUNN, M.D.

On Thursday, March 13, at noon, I was requested to visit Miss S. L., aged eight years and eight months; of a lymphathic temperament, stout, robust frame, mild and amiable disposition. I found her in bed, breathing hurriedly and noisily, very feverish, pulse 130, coated tongue, offensive breath, and dry, hot skin. There was acute pain to the slightest touch under and around the right clavicle and upper third of the right side of the chest, increased by the movement of the body or of the right arm. On closer examination, the upper half of the right lung was found to be congested, and on percussion (which was painful) yielded a dull sound; the crepitant rhonchus, so constant in the first stage of pneumonia, could be distinctly heard without the aid of a stethoscope, which I had not at the time with me. These symptoms accurately pointed out the nature and seat of the complaint, which could be no other than a very severe and sudden attack of inflammation of the lung; there was no complication. On inquiry it was found that the patient had had rigors about five o'clock in the morning, which her elder sister, who slept in the same bed, attributed to play, and told her "not to shake the bed so;" this was clearly the onslaught of the disease, and reminds one more of the sudden attacks of soldiers and others exposed to the inclemency of the weather, than the usual modes of attack on those who are surrounded by every care and comfort. The respirations at this early period were from fifty to sixty in the minute; this symptom, with the noise and distress which it occasioned, was very alarming to all around, and no time was lost in applying the proper remedies. *Aconite* was immediately administered, and as I was going a short journey in the country, expecting to be absent about two hours, I desired the dose to be repeated every hour until I returned. This was faithfully attended to; and on my return, though the breathing was as noisy and hurried as before, yet the pain and uneasiness were a little abated, and *Aconite* was continued every two hours. At bed time considerable relief was experienced and though the patient got only about two hours' sleep, she was not restless, and early in the morning she was more quiet, the sputum was more easily expectorated; it

was rusty, and later in the day tinged with blood. I saw the patient four times before five, P. M., on Friday, and the symptoms were already much less urgent. *Phosphorus* 3 had been substituted for the *Aconite* with marked benefit; after each dose her attendant noticed that on administering it the respirations fell ten in a few minutes. At five P. M., after my fourth visit, I had again occasion to see a patient in the country, and during my absence there was a slight spasm in the affected lung, for which, had I been present, a dose of *Hyoscyamus* would have been given; this very naturally alarmed her attendant, who sent for the medical man I had named, should any emergency arise; he not being at home, the nearest medical man was sent for, who did not either proceed to the sick-room to administer to the necessities of the case, or to allay the fears of her anxious attendant. The first gentleman sent for coming in, and at once proceeding to the bedside of the patient, the parley was stopped, and when they both appeared at the bedside the spasm was gone; and they told the attendant that though the case was one of doubt, there was nothing alarming in the patient's case. On my return I hastened to see the case, and met the medical gentlemen in the drawing-room, after they had seen the patient, and I said there can be no doubt about the disease, much as we may differ about the treatment, and they both agreed (or appeared to do so) that the disease was acute inflammation of the right lung; for which one gentleman told me he would deplete, and the other told me he would not. After this they took their departure, and I visited my patient, and finding no trace of spasm left, I again administered *Phosphorus*, and it was truly delightful to see how beneficially each dose told; the respirations, which had been sixty, falling to thirty at midnight. When I left my patient, I called on my way home at her grandfather's, who lives in the town, to say that I considered my patient out of danger, and this I could do most conscientiously and truthfully, seeing that the pulse had fallen to a hundred, and the respirations, from sixty, had fallen to thirty in as many hours. I was then aware that I had the disease under control, and the *Phosphorus* was ordered to be continued every four hours.

On Saturday morning the temperature of the atmosphere had fallen considerably; there was a sharp frost, and a keen north-east wind blowing. I found my patient easy, lying on the side affected; but the pulse had risen to 106, the respiration to forty in the minute; no pain. I had to approach quite close to the patient to count the respirations, which the day previous were readily heard on the landing, and even down to the drawing-room on a lower floor; expectoration scanty, and without

tinge of blood. As the bowels had not acted since Wednesday evening, I administered an enema of gruel and castor-oil, which was not long retained. I must here confess that I did this, not thinking it particularly requisite, but because such stress is laid upon purging by the generality of people, who seem to agree with Messrs. Morison, Holloway and Co., that violent purging can cure all diseases that flesh is heir to; the enema had very little effect, and I intended after a while to administer a second.

The anxious parents, arriving from a distance (having been summoned by the friends at my request) put a stop to my further progress, which, I will say, had been eminently satisfactory during the forty-six hours that I had attended; the pulse, from 130, had fallen to 100; the respirations, from sixty, had fallen to thirty; but owing to a keen frost and a north-east wind, the latter had risen to 40, the former to 106, but this was unattended by distress. After an interview with the parents, and after I had introduced the mother to her daughter, I took my leave, promising to return in an hour; this, however, was not permitted me. A family consultation was held, the result of which was that my patient, though progressing rapidly towards cure, was taken out of my hands without my being summoned to hear the reasons for such a step.

I do not blame the parents, to whom, medically, I was a stranger, and for whom every allowance, under the painful circumstances, ought to be made. For what I here advance I have a competent witness to bear me out, one who had had inflammation of the lung, and had been cured by my treatment, and one who has had much experience in sickness and of medical men, and one also whose veracity will not be doubted.

Forty-six hours had I anxiously watched this truly terrific onslaught of disease, and amendment had followed every dose administered; I have nothing to regret, nothing to reproach myself with. Had I been favored by Providence with a milder temperature and more genial weather, the progress would probably have been more rapid; but under every disadvantage in this respect, I will defy any candid man to say that under any treatment the progress would have been greater.

Let us now change the scene, and give a truthful diary of what was called "active treatment," and if the old school of medicine has nothing better to oppose to acute inflammation of the lung the sooner it ceases its operations the better; for it has been demonstrated by Dietl, who collected the statistics (these statistics are from his own practice) of three methods of cure, viz., bloodletting, *Tartar Emetic*, and diet only, that the latter was by far the most successful; for whilst the mortality was 20 per cent. by bleeding and *Tartar Emetic*, it

was only 7 per cent. by the treatment by diet only. But to our case: the first dose of drugs that was administered was a *Calomel* powder, then immediately followed two LEECHES ON THE PIT OF THE STOMACH. This latter application, I confess, astonished me very much, because the inflammation was raging in the right lung, and not in the stomach; true it is there was tenderness to pressure on the whole precordial region, but in a general inflammatory state there would be tenderness to pressure nearly throughout the entire body, particularly when this inflammatory state arises from cold. These measures naturally irritated the patient very much, and both pulse and respirations rose, the former to 130, the latter to sixty in the minute. After four hours, the *Calomel* powder not acting, it was followed by a second; and in four hours more, no action being produced on the bowels, by the two, a third was given, which succeeded in purging all good and bad matter from the stomach and bowels, and this concluded the first twelve hours' work, which we may as well review.

In the morning, at 10 A. M., the patient's pulse was 106; respirations had risen to forty, owing to a cold north-east wind and keen frost; the expectoration was free from blood, and easily coughed up; the patient was quiet, easy, and free from pain, *lying on the side affected*. Twelve hours later a marked change had been effected by what was called) and as far as the bowels were, concerned, most truly) "active treatment;" the pulse had risen to 130, the respirations to sixty in the minute; the patient prostrate, irritated, and much very much worse in every respect. Two more leeches were ordered, and applied a little to the right side, but only one took; a dose of fever mixture, ordered to be taken every four hours. The patient passed a most restless night, weak, and complaining—not of pain in the lung, but from sheer fatigue of purgings, leechings, and nauseous drugs. Morning arrived, and with it the medical men (of whom I will say none could have been more attentive), when the treatment was continued. Another leech was applied, the mixture continued every four hours, and in the evening a blister was applied, and this, with much examining, and consequently disturbing the patient, closed the second day's proceedings. A marked change for the worse was again apparent, and the medical men, as well as the friends, despaired of her life; her strength was wasted by the varied means of depletion, whilst the disease had been allowed undisturbed possession of the lung, and the distress of the poor patient, weak, restless, and breathing sixty times in a minute, may be imagined, but cannot be described.

Monday and Tuesday the proceedings were little varied; only one purge was

given, and one more blister applied. The weakness was too alarming even for the depleting school; all hope by such treatment was gone.

On Wednesday, chancing to meet one of the medical men, who verified the above account of the treatment, I told him plainly that such measures would kill the patient, and unless some specific treatment was applied to the lung, the only diseased part, the patient would soon die. I pointed out the means by which he might save his friend's child; I appealed to him in the most earnest manner; I entreated him to alter the treatment and save his patient—*there was yet time*. I offered him the remedy; I desired him to use it not as a suggestion of mine, but his own; I begged him to keep both the fame and the emolument; I showed him statistics of the large homœopathic hospitals, where the mortality from pneumonia is astonishingly low, about 3 per cent.; I told him of the uniform success of the treatment on the lower animals; I referred him to a gentleman in the town, whose son was on the point of death from double pneumonia, which case appeared in the *Homœopathic Times* last year; I also told him what disgrace would await him and his colleague, if, after taking my patient away *who was doing well*, they dosed her to death. He appeared impressed with the truth of what I advanced, acknowledged that the patient was beyond their means of cure (or at least so I understood), but I heard no more from him for several days.

A great change in the temperature coming on during the same afternoon that this conversation took place, and the drugs being discontinued, a little wine being substituted to bring back (vain hope!) the strength they had so needlessly wasted, a lull in this frightful storm took place; the patient became less distressed, she took more notice, the respirations fell to fifty, and during Friday night they reached their lowest point under the depleting method, which was forty-five, never to recede so low again. Providence was extremely kind to these gentlemen, and granted them two days of south-west wind and a mild temperature. Here was a golden opportunity, but how was it employed! in giving wine and barley water to woo back a portion of the strength so recklessly thrown away; and with Saturday's change in the temperature the respirations speedily rose to sixty and upwards; another mercurial purge, which acted four times, and a composing powder at bedtime, closed Saturday's treatment, and the patient was a wretch pitiable to behold.

Can we wonder at the colossal fortunes made by the Morisons, Holloways, Worsdells, and the great and increasing tribe of drastic dronchers, when we see two respectable medical men, of long standing in the

town, employing a whole week, during which time there is a raging inflammation going on in one lung, in violently purging the bowels of a poor little girl who had taken little or no food for ten days, and who, moreover, was neither laboring under obstruction or even slight constipation.

Sunday. Just nine days after I had been superseded, a third blister ushered in the day's proceedings, and *Tartar Emetic*, with wine and barley-water, made up the treatment; the respirations rose above seventy; patient exhausted and less tractable.

Monday. Change of wind to westward; temperature mild, even warm; respirations reduced a little below sixty; more nourishment taken, less wine, but disease in the lung still untouched. Fever mixture every four hours, wine every two, and a composing dose at bed-time, which procured a quiet night, after which the medical men were astonished that there was no amendment; respirations (that true barometer in acute inflammation of the lung) sixty; patient weak and hectic; medicine and wine continued; a composing dose at bed-time. Another quiet night; respirations higher in the morning, above sixty; patient evidently sinking; mixture every four hours; a blister to the back, making the fourth; and all hope gone. The little patient struggles bravely against the combined attacks of disease and doctors, but is evidently sinking under such fearful odds.

Thursday. Allowed to have anything she asks for; ate roast beef, whilst a blister was gnawing at her back. But why pursue the painful details further; the *Prussic Acid*, the *Mercury* and *Chalk*, the *Rhubarb* and other matters equally appropriate, may be left without comment. Let us await the end, which cannot be far off, to make a few remarks upon the different modes and the different results of the homœopathic and allopathic treatment of inflammatory attacks in general, of inflammation of the lungs in particular.

Friday morning. Great pain, restlessness, and irritability; sinking fast; a few brief hours, and all will be over.

Saturday, 29th. The poor little patient still lives, but the end is now very near. For fifteen days and nights has the fond mother watched with the greatest anxiety to witness some change in the little sufferer's condition, but has watched only to see life ebbing out. Oh, that medical men would ponder on the awful responsibility that devolves upon them in such cases, and study the better method of healing! If art can do no more than has been done in this case, better, far better, leave it entirely to Nature, because it has been clearly demonstrated that such cases get well under diet only; and I am firmly of opinion that, had this little patient been continued under the homœopathic treatment, which had already

done so much for her, she would now have been convalescent. The little patient expired at a quarter past two on Sunday morning, and sank calmly to everlasting rest.

After dropping a tear on this little child's grave, let us in all sincerity and truth pass in rapid review the principal points worthy of notice, and endeavor to profit by them for our future guidance. A very sudden attack of inflammation, in whatever part of the body it occurs, is sure to awaken the attention of the patient and friends; and as the attack is sudden, so must the treatment be prompt, or the patient either dies suddenly or some organic change takes place in the part of the body inflamed. But when any such change takes place by total neglect or ineffectual treatment, the victims often only escape sudden death to linger out a painful and weary existence. It will be advisable to state the different modes of treatment pursued by the old school of medicine, and that which has been found so sure and efficacious in the new or homœopathic, and then draw our conclusions as to the best.

I may here observe that I most firmly believe in the honor, the worthiness, and benevolence of the medical profession. I believe that most of its members are anxious to heal the patients that apply to them as speedily, as easily, and with as little inconvenience and expense as is compatible with efficiency; and this is as true of allopaths as homœopaths. I do not credit the tales of sordid avarice that are so frequently and so unscrupulously circulated about medical men. At the same time I am ready to admit that the medical body has unworthy members belonging to it; and to these and to all I would humbly but earnestly say, "Yours is an honorable and a mighty trust; to you the lives of parents, brothers, sisters, and dear children are readily and in the most unbounded confidence committed; take care not to abuse the high confidence reposed in you. You have the power, and I mistake your character very much, if you lack the will to serve honestly, to the best of your abilities, those confided to your care." We must also bear in mind that very great responsibility attaches to all the acts, as well as to the words, of a medical man. If his acts are reprehensible—if his words are characterised by levity and insincerity—if he merely visits his patient to send a pill or a potion, his mission is abused, and he only fulfils the worst parts of it. If he shrouds himself and his language in mystery—if he does not open his entire confidence to the patient, the latter cannot view him otherwise than as a necessary evil, and will be glad when he is able to dispense with his services. It is not thus that medical men ought to be viewed, nor are they when they fulfil their mission aright. A patient, however poor, who confides his secrets to a

medical man, reposes a confidence which ought never to be abused, and deserves to be treated with the utmost kindness and consideration. The twin evils, poverty and sickness, that such a patient labors under, it may not be in the power of the medical man to remove, but he may alleviate the pangs caused by them; and if he cannot do this even, he can pour words of sympathy and kindness into the wounds, and these never fail to have a soothing and happy effect; and when death cannot be baffled longer, a "word in season" may be spoken, which may touch a chord that will vibrate beyond this earthly dwelling.

The profession that can count among its members a Hahnemann, a Hope, and an Abercrombie, and a long list of living worthies imbued with like feelings, may well feel proud. These are the beacons that ought to guide us on our path, which is frequently a rugged one; the lights we must be guided by, if we would attain that eminence which should be the ambition of all. I think I can discern a yet higher eminence for the medical profession than it has ever yet aspired to; but it is only perhaps a pleasing dream, and I need not name it here.

Having said that I give credit to medical men for truth and benevolence, for probity and a desire to use the best means to cure, I yet must confess that, knowing how defective their means are to combat acute inflammations—seeing that, when young and inexperienced, they bleed and purge, and when older and more experienced, they abstain from these often destructive and always harsh means—I say I must confess that I am grieved to see them shut their eyes to the great law of Nature revealed to them by the immortal Hahnemann. I know not by what means they are to be convinced of the truth and beauty of that law, but of this I feel persuaded, that their refusal to study that law will, sooner or later, bring upon them the contempt of the public, and go far to deprive them of that share of remuneration they would be entitled to, if they used the best method of cure. We do, however, bear in mind that it is the fate of all great reforms in science, as well as other subjects, to be ridiculed by the very men who ought to be the first to study and to test them. In regard to Homœopathy, this is easy enough, as any man, not wilfully closing his eyes, may see at any moment; but if medical men persist in ignoring Homœopathy, a day is not very distant when they will find themselves ignored by the public.

I have been led to these remarks from a sincere desire to see the members of the profession improve their position; for it cannot be doubted that the uncertainty of physie, as practiced by a great majority of the profession in England, is rapidly sinking the character of medical men to the level of the

druggist, or, still worse, to the patent-medicine vendor. Inflammations are treated generally by allopathic practitioners by bleedings, blisterings, purgings, vomitings, *Antimony* and *Mercury*: and this is practised, more or less, with little variation, wherever the seat of the inflammation may be. Is it in the brain, to bleed, blister, and give *Calomel* and *Antimony* is common; is it in the throat, the same treatment is applied; is it in the lungs, we have seen how our little patient fared from day to day; and wherever the seat of the inflammation, the same destructive, often dangerous, and always weakening means are used. The uselessness of such means is attested by the selfsame practitioners, faithfully represented, as we must suppose, by the Editor of the *Medical Times*, who, in an abusive article against us poor homœopaths, made use of these remarkable words: "It must, however, be admitted that bleedings, blisterings, and purgings, used to allay acute inflammations, involving a tedious illness and a slow convalescence, contrast unfavorably with the no-treatment by Homœopathy, and a CONSEQUENT SPEEDY RECOVERY."

We have seen that, whatever be the seat of the inflammation, some or all of these methods of depletion are made use of to allay it; but the plainest and simplest mind must be aware that, if a patient contracts a pleurisy, he can have no more blood in his body than he had an hour previous to the attack, and if the blood concentrated unduly on one organ can be made to leave that organ—in other words, if the equilibrium can be restored—there can be no occasion or excuse for reducing the whole quantity of blood in the body, thereby "involving tedious illness and slow convalescence." Now have we a remedy that will restore the equilibrium without depletion of any kind? Do we possess a prompt and specific remedy? I answer, without hesitation, we do; but it is not, as it is in allopathic practice, always the same remedy. In pleurisy, for example, we have *Aconite* or *Bryonia*; in the lung, though *Aconite* is useful to begin with, yet it would not do all that is needed, and here we use *Phosphorus* or *Bryonia*, when the pleuræ are involved; in the brain, *Belladonna*; in the liver, *Mercury*, *Nux Vomica*, etc.

Here is a wide difference between the two treatments: in the one, depletion for all; in the other, remedies harmonic to each. The results are still more striking. Pleurisy I have known to be cured in twenty-four hours; double pneumonia in two or three days; and a cure by homœopathic remedies does not mean a long convalescence, and a host of tonics, bitter beer, wine, and a residence at the sea-side, but health, rosy health, in a comparatively short time.

If such be the results of the different

treatments, if, after recovery from inflammatory diseases by the depleting or allopathic method, there is a slow convalescence, frequent relapses, and such expensive means of recovery, sometimes, alas! leading to habitual inebriation—whilst recovery by homœopathic remedies is speedy, and needing no such delusive and often seducing means—how long, it may be asked—start not, allopath (if any such read these pages), start not when I ask how long such dangerous and destructive means are to be allowed? The rack, the torture, the whip, the mild stocks even, have been swept away by a more philosophic and humane treatment of criminals. Are medical men to be longer allowed to be the only scourges of their race, when all other capital punishments are about to be abolished? Do I invoke the power of the legislature on *your heads*? Do I wish to imitate the Wakleys, old and young, who would gladly consign a benevolent man to Newgate? Do I wish the same measure to be meted out to *you* that the Toogoods, Inglises, and Co. would mete out to *us*? Far from it; but it is time that public opinion raised its voice against such useless, barbarous, and destructive measures. It is time that the public insist on your reasons for still goading them to death with your lancets, your blisters, your burnings, and your poisonous drugs. The public have insisted on a keen supervision of lunatic asylums, where the manacle, the dark cell, the galling chain, have given way to sympathy and kindness, light and air. Shall you be longer allowed to hold despotic sway over the liberty, the limbs, the lives of the people? You, forsooth, affect to be greatly shocked when your imitators, the Morisons, Coffins, and Co., drug an ignorant dupe to death. You kill in a similar manner, aye, and with like means, but you are authorized—you hold a diploma. No jealous Wakley can touch you; the diploma is your license, and you fear no tribunal.

Are all who practice the old method to be thus condemned? By no means: it is only the men who persist, like their prototype Sangrado, in still using the means that are known to be so destructive. Is the practice of Chambers, of Locock, of Clarke, and many learned and experienced physicians, deserving the censure I only wish to pass on the officious Sangrados and drug-dealers? Send a patient to such an one as these, and see with what care he avoids drugs in hopeless cases, and how homœopathically he treats epidemics, not only for the cure, but for prevention. Is he ignorant of the homœopathic law? It is only the Toogoods and Co. who abuse it, without knowing anything of it; and this class bring ridicule upon themselves, and not on us.

Can that practice be guided by *true* medical science, which allows each member to give a different guess as to the ailment, and a different remedy for its cure? Has God given to dogs and wild animals remedies for their ailments, and instinct when to use them and where to find them? and has He given to man, who wears His image, the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms in vain? Has He endowed man with sense to read the stars, and denied him the powers of mind sufficient to select a remedy for his ailments? 'Twere blasphemy to think so. Nature's laws are simple, but never varying. They cannot be altered or twisted to suit our interests; and the immortal Hahnemann has discovered the law of healing as surely as Newton discovered the laws of attraction and gravitation. In true science all is certainty, uniformity, simplicity, and beauty; in pretended science, such as the old school of drugging, all is guess, doubt, and complication. Consult a hundred medical men of the old school, and each will make a different guess at the ailment, and each will certainly give a different remedy. Consult again a hundred homœopaths, and if they will study the case, they each arrive at the same remedy, without pretending to guess about the ailment at all. Which is more worthy the name of science?

I admit that the kindred sciences have advanced with rapid strides to perfection—anatomy, physiology (which, aided by the microscope, leaves little more to be known), chemistry, botany, etc.; but the homœopath avails himself of this increased knowledge as much if not more than the allopath. Can the same advance be claimed for the practice of medicine? It can; but not for the old school, which has rather retrograded than advanced.

There is a fashion too in medicines, as well as in coats. I remember well when *Iodine* was first introduced; it was a rarity to see a prescription without it in some shape or other, and a great many were half-poisoned by its continued and inappropriate use. Now *Cod-liver Oil* is in fashion, and in many cases is very valuable, but its indiscriminate use is sure to end by its being discarded altogether. In short, there is nothing more uncertain and less amenable to rule than the modern allopathic practice of physic; contrasted with the homœopathic, it is as darkness opposed to light. The latter is a science, a law of Nature, a divine gift, which cannot be too highly praised or too highly prized; the former, a chance, always hurtful in some degree, even when it cures. The one is health-giving; the other life-destroying. It is time to desist. I had only intended to give a short history of this unfortunate case, and I have been surprised into writing a pamphlet. Let it pass, I could do no less; and if it

awaken one of my colleagues to seek further information on this all-important subject, I shall be repaid for the pain I have undergone.

Let no man, however, practice Homœopathy who looks more for emolument than the good of mankind; still less let him practise it, if he wishes to sail down life's stream in a pleasure-boat wafted by a gentle and fair breeze. He must be prepared to be buffeted about on the rough sea of life, looked upon more as a pirate than a regular trader. He must be prepared to see all laws of courtesy and honor set aside where he is concerned; nay more, his friends of yesterday will be his foes to-day; the man who would sit at his table and break bread with him to-day, to-morrow, hearing that he is a homœopath, is ready to break his head or his heart, and use every spiteful means to do him wrong. I have felt this acutely—I still feel it keenly; but I feel also that I possess something more valuable than the fragile friendship which can be broken by a difference of opinion. I possess a divine truth; and no pecuniary sacrifice, no loss of friendship, no contumely, no ridicule that may be heaped upon me can make me for one moment waver as to the course I shall continue to pursue. I certainly do prefer the open foe to the false friend: I prefer the rapier in my breast to the muck-fork in my back. On the platform, in the press, in a congress of medical men, I am ready to defend the law that I have studied, the practice that I follow. I have poured out my feelings on paper, *currente calamo*, whilst death hovered round the bed of my amiable patient. I will desist and say, *requiescat in pace!*—*Hom. Times.*

ON THE OBSERVATIONS OF NATURE IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE.

BY ANDREW COMBE, M.D.

Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, one of the Physicians in Ordinary in Scotland, to the Queen, &c., &c.

(Concluded from page 83.)

In a few hours, however, the vessels have contracted, and they and the heart adapted themselves to their diminished contents, and nature thereupon resumes her attempt to carry the disease through its proper stage. The pain returns, the pulse rises, and the oppression augments. Bleeding is again resorted to with immediate relief, and the same phenomena recur. At the third bleeding, we arrive at the period of the *natural* decline of the disease, and consequently no more excitement appears. 'Now, then, we have cut it short at last,' says the doctor, smiling complacently. 'Yes,' says the gratified patient, 'that last

bleeding did the business; but what a pity you did not take more at first, and stop it at once.' With care and good management all goes on well, and by degrees the patient returns to his former diet and habits. If, however, he happens to be a person not of a robust constitution, matters go on more doubtfully, and after partial recovery he finds his strength permanently shaken, or perhaps falls into chronic disease, and ultimately dies, or after a long struggle he may regain his former health.

"If we attend to the observation of nature with a view to *co-operate with her*, and not simply to take her by storm, we shall be guided in our practice by the indications which she presents. In small-pox, for example, or measles, the excitement often runs very high in the first or eruptive stage, and means are required to moderate it. But if we bleed too freely, it is well known that the eruption (which we shall suppose to have come out) will generally disappear, and increased danger to life ensue, because the order of nature being forcibly interrupted, some internal disease is brought on, or the system sinks exhausted. Whereas if instead of bleeding excessively, we keep the patient very quiet, in a cool, well-aired room, and administer cooling drinks, mild laxatives or antimonials, and reserve bleeding for cases of necessity, the probability will be much in favor of recovery. To apply this to the pleurisy. Instead of being intent on *cutting it short*, the moment we ascertain its existence, we would have respect to its natural course and duration, and reserve our means to carry it safely through its regular stages. So far as my observation goes, cures would be more numerous and complete were this principle followed. If a severe bleeding disturbs fatally the progress of small-pox eruption, may it not also, when unseasonably used, injuriously influence the course of internal inflammation, and lead, for instance, to fatal oppression or effusion? We know that *de facto* it is a very rare thing to cut short a smart inflammation by a severe bleeding; but is that a reason for bleeding again whenever the pain returns? I think not. If the inflammation threatens to run very high and endanger life, then depletion becomes a reasonable alternative, but not so if it resumes merely its normal or regular course. If regard were had to the nature of the disease, I am convinced that many cases in which blood is very freely drawn would do well and better by much milder means; and that in many where blood-letting is really needed, a great deal might be spared in point of quantity, with much future advantage to the constitution. Take, again, the beginning of a severe cold or influenza. We know that *de facto* it will increase for several days, after which the feverish state will decline. If, to force it away, we begin with hot drinks and sudorifics, we invariably increase the

fever by adding to the excitement: but if we keep quiet in bed, moderately cool, eat little, and drink mild tepid fluids when inclined for them, abstain from mental excitement and annoyance, the feverish state will be kept down; and if we *then* give a good sedative antimonial, we shall rarely fail to elicit free and relieving perspiration, and to break the force of the disease. If we go out during the *rising* stage, we make the cold more severe, but in the second stage we do good. In the former meat is injurious, in the latter, useful. The principle holds with a slighter cold, but is of course modified in its operation.

"Even the causes of disease, and remedies, themselves produce their effects in a regular order, according to fixed laws which we ought to study and respect; but in practice we disregard this. It is no answer to say, 'Oh, they have acted quite differently in A. B. from what they did in B. C., and therefore they can have no determinate effects.' But find out the disturbing cause which interrupted the regular course in B. C., and the uniformity will become apparent enough. Such a cause must exist, whether we know it or not. Having practically no regard to the laws of the constitution, we are apt to overlook their influence on the operation of causes of disease, and to consider nothing in the light of a cause which has happened more than a few hours before. We forget that there is always an interval of hidden action in the system itself before the effect becomes palpable to sense. Take hydrophobia as a very striking example in proof. A person is slightly bitten on the finger, wipes it with his handkerchief, and forgets all about it, till at the distance of two or three months symptoms of hydrophobia suddenly show themselves, and he is speedily carried off. In the interval, he was unconscious of any change going on, and none was remarked by his friends. Yet nobody can deny that during all that time the poison was in the system, and producing changes of which the fatal paroxysm was the result. Even in the ordinary contagious diseases of small-pox, scarlatina, fever, &c., *several days of silent internal working* always intervene before the poison takes visible effect. This indicates the operation of fixed and determinate laws presiding over the production and course of diseased as well as of healthy actions. We never see a disease start up instantly after the application of its cause, nor full health suddenly take the place of active disease. We see the inhalation of fixed air induce immediate death; but it acts not by giving rise to disease, properly speaking, but by withdrawing one of the essential conditions of life. It is no proof of the absence of fixed laws and a determinate course, to say that the same cause does not always produce the same results. The constitutional state upon which the cause acts is often different, and hence an impossibility of the result being identical under every variety of circumstances.

"By thus insisting on the necessity of a more complete and faithful observation of the course of nature, and of acting more systematically according to her guidance, I am far from meaning that we are to sit with our hands across, and allow things to take their own way. So far from it, it is certain that the principle I inculcate would demand more watchfulness, and give room for a nicer exercise of judgment, and a more consistent, and, I believe, successful treatment. Disease arises either from the habits of the individual, from accidental causes, or from peculiarities of constitution acted upon by these. Hence, on being called to a patient, the first step in the *natural* investigation is to examine the constitutional qualities, to make ourselves acquainted with the mode of life, feelings, &c., and to trace the manner in which the cause has acted or continues to act. All these influences vary greatly both the nature of the disease and its probable course. They also bear directly upon the kind of treatment and its probable success. If, however, we are content to regard disease as an entity, arising by chance and observing no laws, we shall have no inducement to trouble ourselves or the patient with any of these inquiries. Such is in fact the practical faith of the great majority of professional men. They discover the existence of an entity, which in medical works has a certain name, and knowing that in the same books certain remedies are said to be good for that entity, they prescribe them accordingly, without giving themselves much concern about their mode of action or fitness for the individual constitution, age, or stage of the disease, and without inquiring whether there is anything in the mode of life tending to reproduce the malady or not. In many chronic ailments, removable causes are thus often left in full operation, while the effect is partially mitigated, but not cured, by the use of active medicines, and in a short time the whole evil returns in its full force.

"Whereas, if, proceeding according to the order of nature, we can trace the disease to any error in the mode of life, to any external source of danger, or internal peculiarity of constitution, aggravated by either of these two conditions, we can convince the patient of the fact, and give him a rational and confiding interest in the changes which we may recommend, and thus not only promote his recovery, but render him proof against all the seductions of quackery. According to the prevailing kind of intercourse between patient and physician, viz., unhesitating dictation on the one hand, and ignorant obedience on the other—blind faith is the pivot on which their mutual connection turns, a faith which is thus necessarily at the mercy of the chapter of accidents, and is often supplanted by reliance on the first bold and confident quack who comes in the way. People wonder that quackery abounds, and medical men ask for power from the legislature to put it down. They, themselves, how-

ever, are in no small degree its abettors, and they have the remedy already to a great extent, although not wholly, in their own hands. *If they who are educated, and should know better, accustom their patients to the principles of quackery, by themselves treating them empirically,* can they wonder that patients who are not professionally educated, and are trained and treated on purely empirical principles, should be as ready to listen to the assurances of the quack as to those of the regular practitioner, whose manner of proceeding is often so nearly allied in kind, as to present no very obvious marks of distinction from that of the quack? In fact, medicine, as often practised by men of undoubted respectability, is made so much of a mystery, and is so nearly allied to, if not identified with quackery, that it would puzzle many a rational onlooker to tell which is the one and which is the other. And this being the case, it requires no ghost from another world to explain why the profession has decidedly sunk in public estimation, and does not exercise that wholesome influence on public opinion which it ought to do. If the mass acts empirically, it can, in the very nature of things, expect only the amount of respect due to empiricism. The public mind has advanced immensely within the last fifty years, in elevation of view as well as in extent of knowledge. Medicine, however, has advanced only in knowledge; and, on looking back to the writers of 80 or 100 years ago, I incline to think that it has actually *lost* in elevation and comprehensiveness, and even in the perception of its own *nobleness* of sphere. If this be so, we must look within for the sources of regeneration, and for the means of regaining a dignified and honorable place in society. The public mind has advanced, while, in scope and general principles, the professional mind has stood still. To regain respect and relative position, the latter must shoot ahead again, and, on doing so, will regain its influence also.

"Let us, however, return to the case of pleurisy as an illustration. It is in general a well-marked disease; its nature is supposed to be well known, and the indications of treatment as clearly understood as those of any malady to which the human frame is liable. It is, therefore, rather a favorable example of the state of professional knowledge and principles of treatment. And yet, what do we find? Are medical men agreed how it should be treated? They *ought* to be, as it is frequent enough in its occurrence to give ample opportunities for experience: but they are not. In this country, many place their chief reliance on free and repeated blood-letting and mercury. In France, the plan of bleeding *coup sur coup*, in small quantities frequently repeated, is somewhat in vogue. In Italy, bleeding was given up by many, and large doses of tartar emetic were resorted to. In Germany, the cure was often intrusted to homœopathic doses of 'medicaments.' The strange thing is, that pleurisy

is cured by, or at least pleuritic patients recover under, each of these plans, while also many recover under the 'medecine expectante' plan of lying in bed, drinking ptisan, and waiting upon Providence. Even in this country, however, a change has come o'er the spirit of my brethren within my own brief day. When I first opened my professional eyes, the lancet was in great vigor, and a well-employed medical man almost lived in a stream of blood. '*Vigorous practice*' was the order of the day. In typhus as well as in inflammation, the lancet was the sheet-anchor of many, and quantities of strong purgatives were administered, sufficient to put disease of every shape and hue to the rout. Take the same men of vigor now, at the distance of twenty-four years, and they will tell a different tale. It is no longer, 'Be bold and decided and prompt in what you do,' but, 'Be watchful, and trust *something* to nature.' This diversity of opinion and practice seems to me to have arisen partly from different constitutional states, arising from changes of atmospheric or other influences affecting the prevailing character of diseases, but much more from all parties disregarding nature's indications and efforts, and acting heterogeneously and without *any* rational principle. In this way, I believe that under each plan of treatment individual cases recovered which would have terminated fatally under a different mode; but, also, that under all of them many died who might have been saved by a more rational and close adherence to sound physiological principles. To these we may be partially led even by a reference to the symptoms usually present. The sense of cold and shivering, which commonly precede, would lead to the avoidance of exposure. The pain, increased by breathing, inculcates absolute rest and refraining from speaking. The oppressed respiration requires, of course, *purity* of air more than ever. The heat and thirst which soon arise demand cooling, simple drinks, and occasionally tepid sponging of the arms and face. The local stitch asks for mild emollients, such as bran poultices, and the impaired appetite requests the stomach to be let alone. If the bowels are oppressed, a mild laxative or lavement are indicated.

"Suppose the exciting cause not to have been violent or long-continued, and the attack, consequently, one of moderate intensity in an average constitution, the probability is, that by the adoption of the above means alone the disease will run through its course safely, and leave the constitution unimpaired. In this case, effusion of fluid will as usual take place, be moderate in quantity, and be gradually absorbed. This effusion of serum, be it observed, is a natural provision,—1st. for the relief of the vessels of the inflamed part; and, 2dly, for preventing adhesion between the pleura of the ribs and that of the lungs, and, consequently, for the preservation of their free play upon each other. When two surfaces, one of them inflamed, are placed in juxtaposi-

tion, and no fluid intervenes, adhesion takes place, and hampers their mutual action. Within certain limits, then, there is no advantage to be gained by *preventing* the effusion, supposing we could always do so. *If we watch attentively*, and find all going on regularly and smoothly, according to the method by which nature removes the inflammation, why should we step in to prevent, say, any effusion? I believe that many of the extensive adhesions actually met with after death in persons who had at one time suffered from active pleurisy, are the results of over-active treatment interfering disadvantageously with natural processes. Adhesions occur also, however, but generally of small extent, from inflammation so slight in degree as to have suppressed the usual secretion, without leading to any effusion at all.

"Again, suppose the exciting cause to be very energetic, the habit inflammatory, and the attack violent. We, of course, ought to be doubly rigid in the use of the means above mentioned, and in addition we must watch closely, and come in time to nature's assistance to prevent mischief. The reaction may run so high as to induce disorganisation, or the effusion of an albuminous or semipurulent fluid, or to over-excite the brain or heart, and produce distinct disease in them. Or the individual may have some infirmity of body, which renders it more dangerous to wait the usual course of events than to attempt to shorten or arrest it. The thinking physician will take all these contingencies into account, and decide to act; but when he does so, he will still time his measures according to the law of nature.

18th January. So far I had got, bit by bit, in my exposition; but, as writing fatigues me, I must now break it short, and send this away. Keep it merely as a rough and unfinished outline, and not as a proper embodiment of my views. To bring out these, would carry me into writing not a letter but a book. I shall, therefore, not resume the subject, nor for a time must you expect any more letters from me. Yours, &c. A. C.

(To be continued.)

DIFFERENCES AMONG HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTITIONERS.

It is desirable that harmony in views and feelings should exist among the practitioners of Homœopathy. They agree in the law of cure; they agree that attenuated drugs do effect the human system, both in health and in disease; they agree that "the whole of the symptoms taken together is the image of the malady reflected externally, which must indicate the remedy." They also agree that that drug only can be a

remedy which can cause symptoms in healthy persons corresponding to those of the disease. They disagree in the attenuation of medicines and in the repetition of the dose. However important the dose may be, as well as its repetition, we do not perceive the necessity for party feeling on this subject. It is tolerably well established in the experience of homœopathists, that no one attenuation of remedies can be made a standard for a universal rule. One case cannot be cured by the 3d attenuation, but will yield promptly to the 30th. Another will not yield to the 30th, but will to the lower attenuations. Some cases can be cured more promptly by the 200th attenuation than with any one lower. A single dose will cure some cases, while many are demanded by others.

Because of these facts, it follows that we may never reach a point in the attenuations which is alike suitable to all cases. It must, therefore, be left to the judgment of the practitioner to do as well as he can; and, as usual, one man's judgment is better than another, and of course one will be more skillful than another, which condition of things can never be changed. We would, in view of these facts, urge that practitioners of our school should no longer think and express the opinion, that owing to the unsettled state of the question about which they differ, and as, in all likelihood, no satisfactory rule can ever be adopted on that subject, that all take the common sense view of the matter at issue, and admit what is really true, that homœopathic physicians are in harmony in their views of doctrine and practice; and avoid the distraction that must exist in the ranks of the real advocates of Homœopathy among the laity, as well as among junior practitioners. If any one has doubts of the efficacy of the high and highest attenuations of drugs, he need not denounce those who differ from him, but set himself to experiment, as he may have opportunity, and by care and perseverance he will be able to test the subject and convince himself if he is right or wrong. There is, therefore, no occasion for an unpleasant word on this branch of therapeutics. We do not see any reason why the world should not behold what it has never yet seen—a school of medicine, with thousands of members, in harmony in views, in feelings, and in practice. This should be so, and we hope it will be so.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

"The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth."

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, DECEMBER, 1852.

NO. 8.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

BRADFORD INFIRMARY, ELECTION OF SURGEONS.

(From the London Lancet, Oct. 30.)

On Friday, the 22d instant, a meeting of the governors and subscribers was held in the Board-room of the Bradford Infirmary, to elect two surgeons in the places of Messrs. Casson and Douglas, resigned. There was a crowded and highly respectable attendance, and the Rev. Dr. Barnet, Vicar, was requested to take the chair.

Votes of thanks were passed to Messrs. Casson and Douglas, for their past valuable services, and they were unanimously elected consulting-surgeons to the Institution.

Letters were read by the Chairman from Messrs. Poppleton and Bennett, offering themselves as candidates for the vacant offices. After which, the following letter from the Medical Staff of the Institution was read:—

"Infirmary, October 20, 1852.

"The Medical Board have to report that they have examined the diplomas of Mr. Poppleton and Dr. Bennett, and that these gentlemen are eligible according to rule, for the office of surgeon to the Infirmary.

"Messrs. Brereton and Brady have also sent in testimonials, but as the Medical Board have reason to know that they are both homœopathic practitioners, they declined to examine them.

Wm. Macturk, M.D.	Edwin Casson.
Wm. Taylor, M.D.	James Douglas.
J. A. Illingworth,	J. W. Roberts.
Consulting Surgeon.	R. H. Meade."

This letter seems to have taken the meeting completely by surprise, and there was for some moments a dead silence, till the Rev. Chairman remarked that the chair was now open for any observations.

Mr. William Rand here rose, and asked the Chairman whether, after the letter just read from the Medical Board, it would be consistent for him to propose Mr. Brady as a candidate for the office of Surgeon to the Institution? On this subject there was great difference of opinion among the governors present, and a warm discussion arose about it, during which the Rev. J. H. Ryland persistently, and at last peremptorily,

demanding that all the diplomas and testimonials which had been sent up to the Infirmary should be laid upon the table for the inspection of the governors present; but a very unanimous and decisive expression of a contrary opinion at last silenced this pertinacious gentleman.

Several governors expressing dissatisfaction at the conduct of the Medical Staff, in not having examined the diplomas, etc., sent in by the whole of the candidates, Dr. Macturk arose, and said, on the part of his colleagues and himself, that it was not out of feelings of disrespect to the two individuals who had sent them in, but as they were well known to be homœopathic practitioners, it was deemed more advisable not to give them the status of candidates.

No rule of the Institution to the contrary existing, Mr. William Rand ultimately insisted upon proposing Mr. Brady as a candidate for the office of Surgeon to the Infirmary, and said that he had great pleasure in doing so, and stated that Mr. Brady was not only a gentleman and a scholar, but a man of great literary attainments. He was his own medical attendant, and he had been assured by Mr. Brady that he confined himself in his practice to no system; that he was at perfect liberty to administer to his patient any substance whatever in the universe, which he thought would be most to his advantage. (Dr. Macturk, "But does he?"—roars of laughter.)

Mr. J. P. Frank said he had great pleasure in seconding Mr. W. Rand's proposition. At this juncture, Mr. Brady (although neither a governor nor subscriber) was pulled forward by Mr. Frank into the centre of the room from for the expressed purpose of publicly stating what were his principles and practice; he was immediately ordered out of the room.

Before Mr. William Rand's proposition was put to the meeting,

Mr. Meade rose and said, that although these gentlemen had the necessary legal qualifications, yet as they were openly practitioners of Homœopathy, they had virtually forfeited those diplomas, as they had departed from the principles they professed when they obtained them; and he begged

to move as an amendment the following proposition:

"That Mr. Brady is ineligible to be proposed even as a candidate for the office of Surgeon to the Infirmary, as his principles are opposed to those of the medical officers of the Institution and of the profession at large."

This was seconded by Mr. W. Coates, and carried by a show of hands.

Of course, after this resolution the other homœopathist was not even mentioned.

Messrs. Poppleton and Bennett were then appointed surgeons to the Infirmary almost unanimously. And after a vote of thanks to the Vicar for his able and impartial conduct as Chairman, the meeting separated.

[In reference to the preceding illiberal and disgraceful proceedings exercised towards a highly educated and accomplished medical practitioner at Bradford, in the enlightened (!) nineteenth century, the Editor of the *Bradford Observer*, to his honor and credit, has favored his readers with the following well-timed, manly remonstrance, under the head of

INFIRMARY ELECTIONS.

"By the retirement of Messrs. Casson and Douglas—whose indefatigable and able services as surgeons to the Bradford Infirmary, well deserved the encomium pronounced on them by the board—two vacancies have been occasioned, and these have been filled up by eminent and skilful townsmen, whose appointment to the posts of their universally respected predecessors no one hails more sincerely than ourselves. We have not the shadow of a doubt that the elections of Friday last will prove as advantageous to the Infirmary, and as satisfactory to the governors and the public, as they certainly were honorable to the character and qualifications of the successful candidates. We only wish that we could entertain the same respect for the proceedings, as a whole, which we cordially cherish toward both the late and the present medical officers.

"But we cannot feel the respect we could wish to feel for the proceedings connected with the late elections. We have a strong conviction that the principles of action enunciated and applied last Friday are essentially intolerant, unjust and unsafe. It is not to be borne that gentlemen of education, of professional ability, of unblemished reputation, and who, on the confession of their repudiators, had 'complied with the conditions prescribed by the laws,' should be tabooed on theoretical grounds, and be refused the courtesy of so much as an examination of testimonials, furnished 'in compliance with the laws,' and at the request of a public advertisement. We are not annoyed because Dr. Brereton and Mr. Brady are not elected: we had no particular reason for wishing *them* to be successful;

they were not 'our candidates,' and we are perfectly satisfied with the choice made. But we cannot divest ourselves of the impression that the rejected gentlemen have been discourteously and unjustly treated, and that the summary condemnation of the distinguishing tenet of their medical creed, without examination, without argument, without evidence, and without trial, is an outrage upon the assumed freedom of opinion of the nineteenth century.

"Is it to be understood that no new theory in medicine is to be tolerated; that no new principle is to be permitted to live? Is the *Cyclopædia* of medical science perfected; have the faculty nothing further to learn, or the public nothing further to hope? For it must be remembered that, whilst doctors in theology may split hairs in the most ingenious style of Hudibras, and frame creeds and decretals to their hearts' content, the public have the opportunity of reducing all such ponderous learning and party anathemas to mere abstractions, as no one is bound (at least in England) to concern himself with the decisions of Doctor This, or the dogmata of Father That. But in medicine, every rule, every regulation, every prohibition of one practice, or enforcement of another, impinges upon the unlucky bodily frame of some poor patient, whose malady is thus deprived of the aid of advancing science, because the decree has gone forth in favor of the old routine, and medical authorities, like ancient Medians, 'alter not.' In theology we denounce the attempt to coerce conscience and worship by creed; yet in matters of religion we have an authority in the Bible, which can hardly be paralleled in medical economy. Surely the profession of medicine has not yet culminated? Surely, with the experience we have of cholera and consumption, and many other diseases, it is too presumptuous to say—no new theory can arise, no new principle of action shall be recognised? With respect to homœopathy, all we contend for is, that it should take its chance—take it fairly, without favor or prejudice, among the countless other *pathies* and *isms* that generally find their proper level in a few years. On the Continent, and especially in America, homœopathic practice is in high repute; yet in mid-England, gentlemen of excellent standing are turned back with their testimonials *unread*, because they are homœopathists. This is not the way to encourage independent thought, except indeed by means of reaction created through disgust. Homœopathy may be, as a system, untrue, but it certainly is not self-evidently absurd. Should any think it so, they assuredly do not know what are its tenets, and are probably ignorant or heedless of the fact that 'regular practitioners' have for years adopted homœopathic principles in a few well-known cases, even as they

have adopted hydropathy in others. Homœopathists do all that can be expected of man to do, or that it is possible to have done. They explain the philosophy of their practice, which is more than their opponents do; they court discussion, which their opponents evade; they reduce to practice their avowed theory, and are anxious, no doubt, to extend their practice; they are open to modifications, and, in fact, have very materially modified many points of their system; and, finally they invite and challenge the test of experiment, with a view practically to determine the respective merits of the allopathic and homœopathic doctrines. What more can we desire of them?

"We again disclaim all personal feeling, and again disclaim all homœopathic predilections. Our argument is simply one of free opinion, of progressive science, of professional liberalism, and of public safety, which we had rather intrust to the most unrestricted competition, than to close corporations, exclusive patents, and diplomaed vetoes. At all events, the public are the parties most seriously concerned, but the public are, unfortunately, the only parties that are to be mute in the matter."

REFORM IN MEDICINE PROGRESSING.

WE do not doubt that the period is nearer at hand than our most sanguine expectations recognise, when a sort of doctrine which will resemble that taught by Hahnemann, will supersede that of allopathy. We will not deny that this may be a real gain to the healing art, and to the human race. But how unwise it is for practitioners to adopt an imitation, having striking resemblances here and there, and virtually reject the genuine article! Who among us in all the world has so thoroughly studied the doctrines and so carefully practiced the rules of Hahnemann as to be able to pronounce against them, upon reasonable grounds? If in the absence of experience we reason against Hahnemann's practice, then we do as all allopathists do who oppose our whole system; these adopt a false test of Homœopathy; which is, argument based upon allopathic rules; but the true test is, experiment based upon the principles and rules discovered and promulgated by Hahnemann. A modified form of allopathic practice may so lean towards that of Homœopathy as to lead many to believe it genuine; and it is this very

thing which is now progressing rapidly to the overthrow of the usual violent allopathic measures. But it is, however, a forerunner of a radical reform in medicine. For if physicians could break the cords of conventional rules, which are intended to force agreement and harmony, when these affinities have no natural existence in those who hold discordant theories, as among allopathists; if, we say, physicians could break these cords, their minds would experience a freedom which would enable them to perceive their former state of slavery; then truth would work its way through and by them. Each man would labor for the truth according to the abilities with which his CREATOR has endowed him. This mental freedom is much needed in the medical profession; and it is a remarkable fact, not at all creditable to it, that in this age and in this republican country, conventions are held for the express purpose of binding each other still more firmly in mental slavery; but all these efforts will amount to but little, for the spirit of liberty is at work, and men are learning, that conventional rules can only be useful when very general in their character, and that they ought to be perfectly consistent with liberty of thought and action when there is no infringement of any one's just rights. Now, the allopathic school by the change in its practice, which has been progressing for years by the influence of Hahnemann's doctrines, which causes it in some respects to lean towards Homœopathy in spite of itself, may lead many astray, by inducing them to think that Homœopathy can be manufactured out of modified allopathy, which cannot be in the nature of things, for they have nothing in common, there is no affinity between them; they are antagonistic, and whoever embraces the one, of necessity renounces the other. This should be understood, that deception may be avoided, and the progress of genuine homœopathy promoted.

MAGNITUDE AND REPETITION OF DOSES.

BY HAHNEMANN.

My doctrines in regard to the magnitude and repetition of the doses will be doubted for years, even by the greater number of homœopathic practitioners. Their excuse

will be, "that it is quite difficult enough to believe that the minute homœopathic doses have at all the power to act upon the disease, but that it is incredible that such small doses should be able to influence an inveterate chronic disease even for two or three, much less for forty or fifty days; yea, that after so long a time important results should be obtained from these imperceptible doses." My proposition, however, is not one of those which ought to be comprehended, nor one which ought to be blindly believed. No one is bound either to comprehend or believe that proposition. I do not comprehend it, but the facts speak for themselves. The truth of my proposition is demonstrated by experience, in which I have more faith than in my intelligence. Who will undertake to weigh the powers which Nature conceals in her depths? Who will doubt of their existence? Whoever thought that the medicinal virtues of drugs could be developed in an infinite series of degrees by means of triturating and shaking the raw material? Does the physician risk anything by imitating a method which I have adopted from long experience and observation? Unless the physician imitates my method, he cannot expect to solve the highest problem of medical science, that of curing those important chronic diseases which have indeed remained uncured up to the time when I discovered their true character and proper treatment. This is all that I have to say on this subject. I have fulfilled a duty by communicating to the world the great truths which I have discovered. The world was sadly in need of them. If physicians do not carefully practise what I teach, let them not boast of being my followers, and, above all, do not let them expect to be successful in their treatment.

Is it proper we should reject a method of cure until the play of those natural forces, upon which the method rests, shall have been revealed to the sight, and shall have been made accessible to the minds of children? Would it not be foolish to reject the practice of eliciting sparks from flint by striking against it with steel, for no other reason than this—that we do not understand how so much caloric could be latent in the flint, or how this caloric, after being elicited from the flint, could melt the little particles of steel which separate from the steel when we strike it against the flint, and in the shape of incandescent globules set the tinder on fire? We understand nothing of all this, and we have nevertheless followed for thousands of years the practice of eliciting sparks from flint by means of steel. It would be foolish to decline learning to write because we do not understand how thought can be embodied in written words. Just as foolish it would be to reject the method which I have dis-

covered for the cure of chronic diseases, on the ground that we do not comprehend the mysterious agency which that method involves.

PROGRESS OF HOMŒOPATHY AND THE ABANDONMENT OF ALLOPATHY.

The art of healing is one of the most intricate of studies. This arises, not so much as is generally supposed from a want of accurate knowledge of the nature and character of diseases, as from our limited knowledge of the effects of drugs on the human system. Progression on this subject, with the indispensable therapeutic law, necessarily leads to a perfect art in healing; at least there will be a continual approximation to exactness and certainty in the treatment of diseases. It should be borne in mind, what is hardly thought of, that a failure to recover lost health does not in every case imply an erroneous mode of treatment. This is an important fact, full of instruction both to physicians and to patients. In consequence of not properly considering and appreciating this fact, many renounce as well as denounce the most scientific practice. Few persons are willing to view their cases in the light of incurability; and physicians, as testimony of esteem let it be regarded, feel reluctant to admit the inadequacy of their efforts to restore lost health; and in consequence, both are apt to condemn a practice which is the very best human knowledge is capable of employing. Keeping in view these preliminaries, the enlightened and unprejudiced mind is prepared, after due examination of the most ample proof that the nature of the subject admits of, that "*similia similibus curantur*" is the only established therapeutic law. The conviction of its truth, in all who have fairly investigated it, is not disturbed by the fine-spun speculations which have been promulgated to disprove it. In the next place, it seems almost a self-evident proposition, that the only mode of learning the effects of drugs on the human system is, to try them in healthy persons. We doubt if this will be denied by physicians of whatever school, and we are quite sure it will strike every intelligent layman's mind as the most reasonable mode that can be adopted for

the purpose intended. Now, by this method much has already been accomplished, and considering the nature of the labor it is wonderful that so much has been done in so short a time. Not only has a foundation been laid, but much of the building has been run up, and herein has already secured to the profession as well as to the people universally, the most complete *materia medica* hitherto known. We now ask the reader to reflect a moment, to ascertain, if he can perceive anything in the above two points which is obscure, unreasonable, or that should excite contempt, ridicule and violent opposition in a mind that loves and is seeking truth in medicine. The above contains the *gist* of Homœopathy; it is the basis of Hahnemann's practice. Inasmuch, therefore, as we possess an accurate knowledge as far as it has yet progressed of the effects in the human system, of numerous drugs; and a clearly defined law which enables us to employ them for remedies in diseases; together with an ample experience of fifty years; all of which taken together, and viewed in the light of every rule for the application of evidence to the question at issue, the conclusion in every unprejudiced mind must be that Homœopathy is true, and consequently worthy of confidence, and should be exclusively relied on in the treatment of human maladies.

In view of the above mentioned facts, another inference is clearly made out, which is, that Allopathy is false. For it is absurd to suppose that both are true. One or the other must fall, such will be the inevitable result. The signs of the times distinctly show that we are rapidly progressing towards the abandonment of the allopathic *materia medica*; the classification of which is the chief rule for its use, which is an emanation of speculative minds, based upon nothing. In the next place, the removal of the only basis of allopathic practice is in progress, which is that a theory of disease propagates the theory of cure. This lays at the foundation of all allopathic measures in the treatment of diseases. Now, Homœopathy has shed light upon the world touching this, to the opposition, essential matter. She boldly proclaims that a theory of disease and the theory of cure are in-

dependent of one another; that they are naturally distinct existences, so to speak, and a change of the one does not necessarily disturb the other. Homœopathy is a theory of cure, and that only; made up of well established facts, about which there can be no rational controversy, when her rules are strictly observed in conducting the experiments to test her pretended facts.

It is remarkable, and worthy of reflection, that the reform in the treatment of diseases which Homœopathy proposes, is so completely antagonistic in every point to that which had been practised for more than two thousand years, that she should have made any progress whatever in half a century, especially when a large proportion of her professed adherents have but a limited knowledge of her, and remain to this day scarcely half converted. We are in the habit of ascribing all events of very great importance as taking place under the supervision of the SUPREME BEING, as to the nature of the event, the time when it is to take place, and the means which are employed in the accomplishment of his purpose. About the time Hahnemann first proclaimed his thoughts on a reform in the treatment of diseases, the question was mooted—whether the people would not live longer, and enjoy better health if there were no physicians? Physicians were caricatured in many ways, especially by Hogarth in his pictures, and by Foote in his play entitled the "Devil on Two Sticks." The people felt the force of these caricatures, and although they indulged in a hearty laugh at them, at the same time, they realized that the caricaturists had an appropriate subject.

The intelligence of the people advancing, enabled them to question the propriety of what was done for the sick, and they felt uneasy and unsafe. This state of things thus most faintly described, was the moment, the auspicious moment, for the development of just such a man as Hahnemann. He having extraordinary natural endowments, which had been improved by a thorough education and exercising faith in God, he was made to love truth for its own sake. He sought it wisely, ardently and perseveringly, and propagated it freely,

believing in the old adage "that truth is mighty and will prevail." This, in brief, was the state of medicine in the estimation of the people, when Homœopathy was first announced. But her look was so modest, and her manner so unassuming, that for a number of years the people saw nothing in her that was great or glorious. But when one and another, despairing of relief after years of suffering, and spending all their substance, solicited her aid with but little hope; but who in a short time found their sufferings to cease and their lost health restored; in their joy they proclaimed the marvellousness of their experience. Then it was that allopathists lost their usual self-possession, forgot their dignity, descended to the meanest of all measures—misrepresentation and personal detraction. But all this did not avail. Truth in medicine had got a start, and she could not be stopped in her onward course, and in fifty years she reached every civilised and almost every heathen nation on the earth. In conclusion we remark that to our mind, the downfall of Allopathy is certain, and the period is near at hand, when that desirable work will be accomplished: some of her strongholds are already yielding. She bleeds less; she often uses but one drug at a time and comparatively in a small quantity. She tries to appropriate some of the measures of Homœopathy. She is sparing of cathartics and emetics. She speaks against a continued use of drugs by individuals. She even admits that drugs in even small doses may ruin health and ultimately destroy life. She even suspects that the small doses of homœopathists may influence the vital principle. She begins to perceive that homœopathists are not such great "fools" as was thought, for they have secured the confidence of the people by curing them of their diseases. She having progressed thus far, it is fair and reasonable to infer that she will not, while homœopathists are increasing on every hand, retrograde, but on the contrary advance in the knowledge and love of a true healing art.

 Complete sets of this Journal may be had, stitched, at one dollar a volume. Address the Editor.

FIERY INDIGNATION.

To the Editor of the Lancet.

SIR:—The following note I addressed and sent to the Editors of the "Homœopathic Directory," and informed them of my opinion.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
R. D. STATTER.

[copy].

Liverpool, No. 1 Oxford-st.,
25th Oct., 1852.

To the Editors of the London and Provincial Medical Directory, 4 Adam-street, Adelphi, London.

GENTLEMEN:—I beg to acknowledge the arrival to hand of your second and last application for the insertion of my name in your Directory. Since its first publication, you are too well aware that the profession has been burthened by a parasite, under the name of Homœopathy, foreign to its philosophical inductions, and which has neither an atom of sense nor a grain of reason for a basis to stand upon.

Such being the case, the sooner it is expunged the better; and I am sorry to see that you, who should be truly *jealous of the honor and dignity of our profession*, still persist in countenancing men who prostitute their intellects at the shrine of a fashionable quackery for the sake of filthy lucre, who are undoubtedly liars, knaves, and something worse. This I say in pity, not in anger.

No, thank God! I think I shall be able to face the world without the patronage of my name being inserted in a Medical Directory of such a caste, in company with men of such unprincipled actions; and although you append the opinions of eminent men in the profession, I care not.

I am content that my name be left out entirely—in fact, I would prefer it; so please erase it entirely; it is no honor to be in such company.

You have been, in your applications to me, at the expenditure of two postage stamps; I return them enclosed, and

I remain, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
RICHARD DOVER STATTER.

Some of our readers may require a few words to explain the above letter. The *Lancet*, where it appears, is a *rabid* allopathic Journal, published in London, and with the exception of the *Medical Gazette*, of this city, it is the most unfair print, towards Homœopathy and her practitioners, we know of. In London there is published annually a Medical Directory, which is intended to embrace all diplomated physicians and surgeons. Lately, when the pub-

lisher of said Directory was about to issue it, the question arose whether the names of homœopathists should be inserted in it. This question gave rise to an animated discussion on the part of a number of allopathists, in the form of letters, which appeared, of course, in the London Lancet, of which the above is an example. We place this letter of Dr. Statter in our columns, not only because it boldly and frankly avows his views and feelings towards men who are, to say the least, of equal standing with himself in birth, morality, professional learning and experience, but who take the liberty to differ from him in the treatment of diseases, but we do so because it expresses the feelings and speaks the sentiments of allopathists generally in their blind zeal in opposition to a reform in the healing art which does not tally with the doctrine of their school:

"THE REGULARS."

In the Bradford Observer (England), Dr. P. A. Brady, of the homœopathic school, publishes a letter explaining the uneourteous treatment he received at the hands of allopathists connected with the "*Bradford Infirmary*," from which we extract the following truthful remarks, as every layman knows who has had professional dealings with allopathists.

In the first place, in the allopathic school, all medical men differ from each other in their mode of practice. There is no accordance of opinion amongst them, and there never has been such. In every age, on every subject connected with the treatment of disease, difference of opinion has been the rule, and accordance the exception, amongst the members of the medical profession; and at the present day, it may be positively stated, that no two physicians would treat the same disease in the same manner. Nay, in the very diagnosis of the case, they will be too frequently at variance with each other, the difference of opinion thus commencing at the very threshold of the inquiry. Provided, then, that our patients were cured only as safely and as certainly as those of men who differ from us in opinion, this difference should constitute no reason why we should be deprived of the honors conferred by the public on the profession at large. Must it not be regarded as intolerant and unjust, that I who, having practised the allopathic system of medicine for nearly twelve years, and afterwards having ex-

amined by theoretical study and experimental investigation, extending over five additional years, the claims of Homœopathy, may not be permitted to select that mode of treatment which I may consider to be best and safest, and most in accordance with the laws of nature? Whilst in the allopathic school opinions may vary with the barometer; whilst one may advocate bleeding in pneumonia, and another reject the practice as dangerous and bad; whilst one may vaunt mercury in the same disease, and another prefer antimony; whilst hardly any two physicians can agree on the treatment of a single disease; whilst the remedy which is now lauded as valuable, may to-morrow be condemned as injurious; whilst they may turn and twist, laud and condemn, bleed, physic, and blister, or let all alone, and leave the case to the safer powers of nature, are we alone to be deprived of all discretion, and robbed by an intolerant sect of the professional honors due to us on account of a long and expensive course of medical and general education? Surely, to have had the moral courage to leave the beaten track, which was acknowledged by all medical authority to lead only to doubt and difficulty, and to have extended the field of our researches, should not have cost us so dearly. Surely, the public, which is to receive the benefit of those researches, and in whose hands the power and the authority solely exist of conferring civic honors, should not have sanctioned the conduct pursued in the Bradford Infirmary on the occasion of the late election—conduct so subversive of this freedom of opinion, which is not only the bulwark of political liberty, but the handmaid of scientific progress.

UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN.

A "chair" of homœopathic medicine is about, it is said, to be established in the University of Berlin.

As the Queen of England and the King of Prussia are close allies, she at least will not despise this initiation of Homœopathy in the Prussian University; as they are associated together in giving a Protestant bishop to Jerusalem, her Majesty may also sympathise with this move on the part of the Chief of the Protestant Princes of the Continent in favor of Homœopathy. Who can tell? We leave the point for the consideration of the Coroner for Middlesex and of the Editor of the *Lancet*.—*Hom. Times*.

BETHLEHEM HOSPITAL.

A correspondent addressed to us a letter, published in our last number, on the mismanagement of Bethlehem Hospital; and in

the belief that this subject will excite a painful interest among our professional brethren, we shall deviate from our usual course to place before our readers a few facts relating to the shameful mismanagement of this Institution. The Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy has been recently published, and a more sickening record of loathsomeness and barbarity has probably never before been divulged. It is almost incredible that in this age, so boastful of the admirable management of its public institutions, when our profession has especially signalled itself by its efforts to ameliorate the condition of the insane, and some of its leading members have been deservedly eulogised for their enlightened philanthropy in numberless perorations, when it has even been supposed that the principle of humanity had been carried to a point that verged upon error and imprudence—it is almost incredible that at such a time abuses so enormous, cruelties so foul and shocking as those related, should have been perpetrated in the first public institution of the kind in the country, whose very name is an exponent to the popular mind of all other such establishments, in a ROYAL ASYLUM, whose government has been confided to a numerous and, conventionally speaking, respectable Board of 300 Governors! Such shameless acts as those reported can only be accounted for on the presumption of a laxity of discipline highly culpable on the part of those on whom the responsibility of conducting the affairs of the Institution devolved. Sir Peter Laurie was Chairman of the Committee, and it is marvellous how he, who has a keen eye for abuses, and especially delights in *putting them down*, should have been blind to the scandals committed by hirelings under his own control, in an establishment for whose government he was pre-eminently responsible! It would be well if Sir Peter exchanged the quixotism of his past career for a serious and resolute effort to do his duty in those offices which he has been especially called to fill, on the presumption of superior capability. What shall we say, too, of Dr. Webster, one of the Governors, who has been exposing with untiring zeal the imperfections of foreign asylums, yet appears to have been lamentably ignorant of, or indifferent to, the abuses for which he too, by the virtue of his office, must be held responsible? We should think that both these gentlemen must feel uneasy at the tardy but startling exposure of the malpractices in their favorite Institution.

It appears that at the back of Bethlehem Hospital there are certain basement wards, in which the refractory patients are lodged. These wards have been the obscure scene of brutalities, at the report of which the feelings recoil with horror. But the wail of the neglected and the oppressed has at last

pierced their walls, and the sympathy and the succor of the humane will quickly reach the unhappy inmates. It requires no art to exalt the description of the impure and flagitious acts that have been daily and habitually transacted in these dungeons. Let the unvarnished Report of the Commissioners tell its own tale. We quote these sentences from the Report:—

“The bedding provided for the patients in the back basements, where such of the refractory patients as are wet or dirty sleep, is open to serious objection, and the state in which the females of that class are placed in bed is not merely most objectionable, but most discreditable. The bedding in that part of the ward for the most part consists of loose straw, placed in a crib or trough-bedstead, and covered with a blanket, and upon this the patient is laid in a state of complete nudity. This practice, which has prevailed for years, has gone on without challenge from, and even (as is stated) without the knowledge of, the treasurer, the physicians, the resident apothecary, the matron, or any other of the responsible authorities of the Institution. The existence of such a state of things, while it discloses a most reprehensible practice, at the same time proves that most culpable laxity must have prevailed in the internal supervision of the hospital. . . .

“John Welsh, one of the keepers, an intelligent man, who was formerly in the 1st Battalion of the Rifle Brigade, and who had been about four months in the hospital, corroborated the statement made by one of the unfortunate patients, as to having his throat squeezed; this man subsequently died. The instrument of torture was a stocking tied in a noose, and tightened till the patient was nearly strangled. This was done to keep them quiet while their clothes were being put on. . . . A man named Parkenson came in from the Strand Union, who was full of antics, and very stubborn to be dressed. The same keeper, Seth Thomas, called him to assist in dressing Parkenson. He put the stocking round his neck, and he was actually strangled. Welsh said, ‘You will strangle the man,’ and he replied, ‘We must do it to exhaust them, or we would not be able to dress them.’ Some laborers who were at work were looking on at the time. When the cell was unlocked Parkenson ran out, and Welsh caught him in his arms, and Thomas put the stocking round his neck. Welsh and another keeper then dressed him, and he got black and blue in the face. Welsh said, ‘You are strangling the man; for God’s sake, don’t do it!’ and Thomas said, ‘We must exhaust him.’ The dirty patients were always washed, even in the coldest weather, with cold water from the shower-bath. The patients in the lower wards were struck by the keepers. . . .

"William Beach, who had been a keeper from the month of July previously in the hospital, also gave evidence as to the general harsh and cruel treatment of the male patients by the keepers. On one occasion a patient kicked him, and Thomas told him to take him into the back basement and punish him. Beach took him in, and shook him by the shoulder, and then let him go, on his promising not to do it again; and Thomas said, 'You do not half give them a — good hiding; if it was me I would give it him.' He had seen two of the keepers kneel upon a man until he sang out 'Merey.' One morning, Berry, another keeper, brought down a patient who had been a little obstreperous. Berry gave him a tremendous kick behind, and kicked him right out into the yard. Another patient, who saw the transaction, wrote a letter addressed to Dr. Wood, complaining of this conduct, and gave it to the man that had been kicked. Berry got hold of the letter, and told the writer, 'if ever he found him writing letters again, he would break his — back.'

"Let the humane reader credit the fact, that *fifteen female patients* have been suffered to lie for years in a state of complete nudity on wretched trough-bedsteads, in the cells of the basement wards of this our NATIONAL ASYLUM! That loose straw, befouled with their excretions, was their litter, and their only covering in all seasons a single blanket! If by a remote possibility some callous heart could find an excuse for such an arrangement, what could he reply to the revolting charge that these poor creatures when dirty were *laid down like dogs on the cold flagstones of the pavement, and mopped with cold water from a pail?* One nurse held down the patients, while the other vigorously plied the mop till the process was completed. Neither cloth nor towel was ever used to dry them after the mopping process, and their clothes were put on while they were still drenched and dripping with wet!

"As might be expected, where the cleansing process was performed with so little sense of humanity, the patients were allowed to sink into a loathsome state of disease. One unhappy woman, Miss Hyson, 'was covered with sores; her hair was matted and full of vermin;' she was suffering under a 'dangerous bodily complaint (prolapsus), requiring great care and attention, and swollen legs,' yet she was one of the fifteen subjected to the brutalities of the nurses, and never received due medical aid.

"The morality of this Institution seems to be on a level with its discipline. One of the keepers seduced a patient, and another of the patients overcame the virtue of a daughter of a laundry-maid. Oaths and execrations were the familiar language of this Hades; complaints were met with

repulsive epithets and violence; and if a patient was refractory, he was immediately tortured with the garotte, an instrument made by making a noose in a stocking and twisting it round the unfortunate creature's throat until he was nearly strangled! But why need we detail more minutely the varied iniquities of this house of torture, filth and depravity? Enough has been said to stir the indignation of the country, and to compel the interference of the Government to secure a better system of management for this ill-fated institution.

"It appears that the jurisdiction of the treasurer is paramount in the establishment, and that the medical officer has only a shadow of power. Over the male side of the asylum, it is true, the medical officer divides the duty with the treasurer, but he is not permitted to make his visits over the female side without the presence of the *matron, and he has no power to interfere with the moral treatment of the insane.* He may 'suggest' to the treasurer and matron the necessary changes and discipline, but it entirely depends upon the will of these officials whether these suggestions are or are not carried into effect! Can any arrangements be more absurd or pernicious?

"There is a remedy for these disgraceful proceedings—that the Institution be placed under the authority of the Commissioners in Lunacy, and be regularly inspected; that the present virtually irresponsible Board of 300 Governors be abolished or re-organized, and that the responsibility devolve on a single chief. By such a measure atrocities like these enumerated can never again occur in this desecrated building."—*Med. Circular.*

The Editor of the Hom. Times appropriately remarks:—

"Here is a picture worthy of the pen of DANTE, drawn by an allopathic writer, of an allopathic Institution. These atrocities have been perpetrated in a ROYAL ASYLUM, that boasts of a Board of 300 Governors. Supposing such a picture could be presented of a Homœopathic Institution, imagine the indignation of the *Lancet*, the *Medical Times and Gazette*, and of all the other allopathic medical journals. Oh! the fierceness and the fury of the allopathic wrath that would have been poured out in such a contingency.

"We ask our readers to consider this Report of BETHLEHEM HOSPITAL; to weigh well the facts of the case; and now, as always, with respect to medical treatment, we claim the pre-eminence for HOMŒOPATHY. Will the authorities give us Bethlehem Hospital for ten years? Let us so institute the comparison between homœopathic and allopathic therapeutics."

HOMŒOPATHIC INTELLIGENCE.

The *Hamburger Correspondent* of the 25th October contains the following paragraph,

under the date of Hanover, Oct. 21st:—"It is remarkable that in all the notices which have appeared in the public papers respecting the journey of their Majesties and suite to Wurtemberg, no mention has been made of the physician accompanying the Royal Family, who is the homœopathic physician Weber (*Sanitätsrath*, sanitary councillor—a royal title). That this gentleman attends upon his Majesty, especially for his eyes, in the absence of Dr. Leeuw, has long been known. From his being one of the royal suite, it is evident that the whole Royal Family is now intrusted to Homœopathy."

ON THE OBSERVATIONS OF NATURE IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE.

BY ANDREW COMBE, M.D.

Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, one of the Physicians in Ordinary in Scotland, to the Queen, &c., &c.

[Continued from page 104].

Assuming the general accuracy of the views contained in the preceding letter, we shall be warranted in inferring from them that the radical fault of a large portion of the prevailing medical practice consists—1st, in prescribing for the abstract disease, irrespective of the constitutional condition of the patient; 2dly, in placing the chief reliance, even in cases where the active interference of the physician is not at all required, on the use of drugs and active means, the operation of which, from their administration being guided by no principle or well understood rule derived from experience, tends not unfrequently to impede and disturb the restorative efforts of nature; and, lastly, in the general and often entire neglect of those physiological or hygienic arrangements which, from their co-operation with the intentions of nature, contribute so powerfully to the well-being of the individual when he is in health, and to his recovery when attacked by disease. But much as these defects impede the present efficiency of medicine as a practical art, they do not in the least disprove its firm foundation in the laws of nature, or detract from the value of its principles, when properly applied (as they also often are) under the guidance of reason and experience. On the contrary, by laying bare the causes of the blemishes by which the medical superstructure has been disfigured, we not only show how they may be removed, but hold out the prospect of medicine being ultimately brought to as high a degree of certainty and perfection as any *estimative* science can attain. For even were all its constituent elements as fixed and certain as those of mathematics, their application must still be made by men of varying powers and knowledge to patients

of different ages, sexes, habits, and constitutions; and it is plain that, under circumstances so inherently variable, there must always be such a wide field for the exercise of individual judgment and skill, as to render absolute similarity or equality of practice a moral impossibility. Approximate results are all that can be looked for.

Keeping to essentials then, and believing as I do, from the force of evidence, that ordinary medical science rests on a solid and natural foundation, I see great reason for endeavoring to improve and purify its doctrines and practice, but none whatever for abandoning the principles on which it is based. So far from this, I am more than ever persuaded that the observation of the order of nature is at once the surest guide we can have in the study and treatment of disease, and the only means by which we can arrive at a correct estimate of the special action and relative value of every therapeutic agent, whether homœopathic or eclectic. The same remedy prescribed at different stages of the same disease may be followed by consequences so widely different as wholly to mislead us, if we do not use the necessary discrimination. Thus, an infinitesimal dose or an ordinary drug administered just at the crisis or turning-point of a disease will be followed by an alleviation of all the symptoms; but surely it would be unreasonable to infer, merely from that sequence, that the dose or the drug was therefore *the cause* of the amendment. On the other hand, when a medicine in itself useful or harmless, given eclectically or homœopathically during the increase of the disease, fails to prevent that increase from taking place, are we on that account warranted in inferring that it was the *cause* of the subsequent aggravation of the symptoms? Certainly not; and yet such inferences are so frequently drawn on equally slender grounds, that I, in common with most of my brethren, have had the mortification to receive unmerited praise and gratitude on the one hand, and blame on the other, for good and bad consequences which I was conscious were wholly independent of and unconnected with the drugs which were supposed to have caused them. In both instances all that could be justly said was, that the phenomena which ensued were *subsequent in point of time* to the administration of the medicine; and hence, unless we discriminate carefully between mere sequence and actual causation, we may easily be led by supposed experience into the most grievous errors. A case illustrative of this principle occurred a few days ago. A young lady complained of troublesome palpitation of the heart brought on by unusual agitation of mind. At the very time when the exciting cause was removed, a homœopathist was consulted, and prescribed a globule. In a day or two the

symptoms began to subside, and in a few days more they ceased. The homœopathist knew nothing about either the existence or cessation of the exciting cause, and therefore would naturally consider the result as produced by his medicine. In reality, however, the supposed cure was so palpably the mere return of quiescent and regular action in a healthy subject, after the exciting and disturbing cause had ceased to operate, that the homœopathist himself would never have thought of ascribing it to anything else, if he had been fully aware of all the facts of the case.

It is from not taking sufficiently into account the many modifying causes which may influence the progress and results of disease, altogether irrespective of any drugs which may have been administered, that the most opposite conclusions may be honestly arrived at regarding the efficacy and merits of the treatment pursued. In the preceding letter, taking small-pox as an example of a disease known to pursue a regular course, I contrast the safety and advantage of a treatment conducted according to the indications of nature with the mischief which may be done by interfering violently with her order of proceeding; and show how differently the same indications may be interpreted when we have no sound principle to guide us. A few weeks ago, two cases of this disease occurred, so strongly illustrative of both propositions, and so entirely in harmony with the views we are both advocating, that I cannot refrain from shortly alluding to them. The first patient was attended by a general practitioner, who, it was said, had improperly resorted to copious and repeated blood-letting at the beginning of the attack. The eruption did not come out freely, and the patient sank. The second case occurred in the same family, but was attended by a judicious and watchful homœopathist, who adopted what I have described as the natural treatment, but with the addition of certain infinitesimal doses. The result was, that the disease went through its regular course, and terminated in complete recovery. By some of those interested in the two patients, this result was proclaimed to be a triumph of Homœopathy over "Allopathy;" but, considered impartially, and assuming the accuracy of the statements made to me, the triumph, if there be any (for it does not follow that because the first patient died under the treatment pursued she would *necessarily* have recovered under the homœopathic), may more justly be regarded as that of rational over irrational practice. Not having seen either of the cases, and not being accurately acquainted with their details, I shall not pretend to pronounce a positive opinion concerning the influence of either the bleeding or the globules; but as the results in both in-

stances coincided exactly with those specified in my letter, written four years before they occurred, as likely to attend *good* as contrasted with *bad* general treatment, I can scarcely be accused of uncharitableness in still doubting whether the globules had any real share in bringing about the recovery which report ascribed wholly to their agency.

Connected with, and arising out of, the same neglect of the natural history of disease is another difficulty, which greatly impairs the value of many of the cases published as illustrative of the efficacy of either system of treatment. In the majority of instances, the vagueness and meagreness of detail are such as to render it impossible for the reader to form, *from the data before him*, even a rational conjecture how the disease has arisen, or what constitutional or external causes are in operation to influence its intensity and affect its duration. It is precisely the obscurity inseparable from these omissions which often renders it difficult for the practitioner to appreciate the real agency of a new remedy or mode of treatment, where the unprofessional friends, from unconsciousness of their own ignorance, see only the clearest evidence of its efficacy, and are apt to express amazement and indignation at what they consider the wilful blindness or prejudice of the practitioner, who, still feeling a doubt, asks for further evidence before sharing in their enthusiasm. Not aware of the many sources of fallacy which lie in the way, the bystander attaches unhesitating faith to the narratives of cure, the very marvellousness of which is sufficient to call for the exercise of a prudent caution before perilling the lives of others on the assumption that the narratives contain a pure embodiment of truth.

It is for this reason, also, that I consider the numerous cases published in some recent homœopathic works to be individually valueless as *proofs*, either of the action of homœopathic remedies, or of the superiority of the new system to the old. Taken in the aggregate, their results may constitute a fair ground for further inquiry; but, individually, little weight can be attached to them as proving the specific virtues of any particular medicine, or the reality of its influence on the cure. They contain a mere statement that certain symptoms were complained of, and certain remedies prescribed, and that certain changes followed; but they afford no concomitant information regarding the mode of life and causes which led to the diseases, or the hygienic observances by which the exhibition of the remedies was accompanied; and, consequently, the reader is not enabled to form an opinion of his own as to the agency by which the cure was effected. To the homœopathist himself, who watched the cases, they may be

pregnant with meaning, because he may have satisfied himself on these points; but to his readers they are nearly barren as items of evidence. This, indeed, is a defect inherent in a large proportion of ordinary as well as homœopathic cases, although in a smaller degree; and, as a consequence, cures are often ascribed to the use of drugs, which have in reality had nothing to do with them. A case in point occurred to myself shortly before I relinquished practice. A delicately-constituted boy fell into a state of health which excited the alarm of his friends, who consulted several practitioners about him without benefit. The treatment prescribed seemed to have been in many respects appropriate, but little advantage was derived from it. This led me to minuter inquiry, and I found that the guardians of the boy, in their anxiety for his mental progress, kept him at school from an early morning hour till late in the afternoon, and thus prevented him from obtaining a due supply of nourishment to support his strength, till, by the mere lapse of time, he became exhausted and irritable. They conceived a biscuit or a piece of bread in the forenoon sufficient for him, because it seemed to be so for other boys. I prescribed a mild tonic for immediate relief, but insisted that he should have a longer interval in the forenoon for exercise in the open air, and an early dinner of plain nourishing food. The decided amendment which speedily ensued was attributed by some of the friends to the *medicine*; but, in reality, it was due almost exclusively to the regimen being brought into harmony with the laws of nature. Similar medicines prescribed by others had been of no use; but, conjoined with the required change of regimen, their operation, so far as it went, was beneficial. Every medical man must have met with similar cases, and also with many in which it remained difficult for him, even after the most careful consideration, to determine what was the real agent in the recovery which ensued. If, in the case of the boy, I had prescribed a homœopathic globule instead of the simple tonic, recovery would, I believe, have equally followed; but would the infinitesimal dose have been on that account entitled to the credit? I refer to this because I am acquainted with several cases of homœopathic cures equally equivocal as this would have been, but to which much importance has nevertheless been attached; but I need not occupy your space with their details. To my mind they do not indeed *disprove* Homœopathy, but they do show that nature, duly seconded by the arrangements of the practitioner, is adequate to the cure of many diseases, without his resorting to drugs of any kind.

Speaking, then, from a general view of medical practice, I should say that it is open to the charge of being carried on

without due regard to the period and natural course of the disease, or to any other recognised principle which can yield us safe guidance, and that this is the cause of much of the uncertainty and contradiction for which our art is proverbial. We too often, I repeat, attack the disease as if we had to deal with an entity, and not with a state of a *living being* of a determinate constitution, who is suffering under it, and whose qualities, tendencies, and powers of endurance, consequently require to be taken into account as well as the disease itself. These defects, however, are not inherent in, and inseparable from, medicine. They are simply the defects of its cultivators; and if we were to begin by making ourselves acquainted with the laws of action of the different bodily organs, with the natural history of the diseases to which they are liable, and with the physiological conditions most favorable for their restoration, and then endeavor to deduce our curative indications from a general consideration of all those circumstances, there is every probability that we should make a nearer approach to unanimity of opinion, because then every one would set out from the same starting-point, and proceed in the same direction towards the goal.

(To be continued.)

THE PREPARATION OF DRUGS FOR HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE.

Accuracy is essential in attenuating drugs for successful homœopathic practice. Every practitioner should be convinced by the necessary proof that the preparations he uses in the treatment of diseases are genuine. We very much doubt if any mode which has been proposed that differs from Hahnemann's is an improvement. An old-school notion prevails too much in the minds of most of us, which is, that the curative efficacy of drugs is in proportion to the quantity. The truth is, the curative effect results, 1st. From the homœopathicity of the drug to the individual case of disease. 2d. To its proper attenuation. All homœopathic practitioners agree in the first, whilst in the second there is anything but unanimity. We mean no offence to our brethren of the profession, but so far as our own observation goes, we have noticed for a long time that those who are the most careful practitioners look upon the degree of attenuation of the remedy almost of equal importance with a strict adherence to the therapeutic law in ascertaining it. Therefore, if it be true that

drugs should be attenuated to develop their curative powers, it must follow that accuracy is essential in their preparation.

BENEVOLENT—VERY.

Allopathists of late show an unusual disposition to do good to the clergy, who, they insinuate, are so incompetent to form an opinion of medicine that they have mistaken a true healing art (Allopathy), and have gone over by hundreds to Homœopathy. Some one is amusing himself with the Medical Gazette, and proposes to its Editor to raise, by voluntary subscription, a sufficient amount to "supply every clergyman in the State of New-York" with the next volume of that print; and the reason assigned is: "He thinks that the wide diffusion of the Gazette would do more to overthrow quackery than any other course which could be pursued." The editor seizes upon this piece of ridicule and treats it as a sincere proposition. Only administer to the Gazette's vanity, and humbuggery is received by it as a reality.

OPIUM IN DELIRIUM TREMENS.

There are many remedies placed within our reach more valuable to the sufferer than rubies, easing his pains and prolonging his days. *Opium* may be mentioned amongst this class, and may be called almost the specific for delirium tremens—the drunkard's delirium. The peculiar nature of this complaint and the proper method of treating it were first brought into general notice in 1813 by a little work of Dr. Sutton's, of Greenwich. He saw a good deal of the diseases of the smugglers, and of the customers of the smugglers, who frequent the coast of Kent, and he was struck by the different event of this disorder in the hands of different practitioners, according as bleedings or narcotics were adopted.

We will now give a picture of the disease from a case on record. "The patient was a large strong man, between thirty and forty years of age. He had been without sleep for several nights, somewhat incoherent, and (what is not usual in such cases) violent; threatening and striking those about him because they refused him access to strong drink. He was joint proprietor with another in a ginshop, and for some time previously he had been a sot, and daily muddled with drink. There was not much tremor. 'I found,' says his allopathic physician, 'that the object of his partner

and relations in sending for me was that I might sanction his removal to St. Luke's, for his strength made him altogether unmanageable, and his insane and extraordinary conduct was hurting the business of the house. I declined to take any part in consigning him to a madhouse, and recommended *Morphia* (a preparation of *Opium*). After one full dose he soon slept; and the next day he was quite rational, and comparatively well." This was a brilliant cure often achieved with allopathic hands. "*Palmarum qui meruit ferat.*" Then how do the homœopathists account for these cures? They rejoice to state that it is confirmatory of the truth of the homœopathic law, let like be treated by like. The poisonous effects of dram-drinking and *Opium* are strikingly analogous, which are here placed side by side.

Effects of Drunkenness, as seen in Delirium Tremens.

Effects of Opium, as manifested upon Opium-eaters.

Red face.	Face deep red.
Eyes injected.	Eyes inflamed.
Constant chattering.	Rambling.
Tremors.	Tremors.
Delirium.	Delirium.
Pulse accelerated.	Pulse accelerated.
Sleeplessness.	Sleeplessness.
Death by coma.	Death by coma.

Opium cures symptoms similar to what *Opium* is capable of producing, this is what is understood by Homœopathy. Forty years ago, drunkard's delirium was treated by bleedings, etc.; it is now universally treated by allopaths with a homœopathic remedy, and yet they abuse the bridge that carries them safely over.

Well might Fontana exclaim, "I know the power of prejudice in favor of old erroneous doctrines; and how great the resistance is even in the most certain and luminous experiments." Prejudice has certainly a great share in this repugnance, but, above all, self-love dreads to adopt new truths because they carry with them a tacit avowal of ignorance. Hence arises the difficulty of bringing those who are advanced in years, and men of learning who have already acquired reputation, to admit of new discoveries.—*Hom. Times.*

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PHYSICIAN—THE PROFESSION ITS OWN ENEMY.

The noble art of medicine will yet be brought out in all its beauty, and made to subserve the purpose for which it is adapted. The day of baseless theories is passed, no longer disturbing and misleading the mind of the real student. Facts, facts are now

sought for, and all theories must be based upon proved facts. By this course of investigation, carried on by so many zealous minds who seek truth for the love of it, it cannot be otherwise than a development of a rational mode of treating diseases, which shall approximate certainty as nearly as the nature of the subject admits of. The minds of practitioners generally are impressed with the necessity of accuracy in studying each case of disease, and following the same accuracy, select that drug which is the remedy. The true mode of cure is hardly yet understood, and although homœopathy was promulgated half a century ago, yet her principles are not fully comprehended even by her best students. Yet she is progressing, and ultimately will enable her practitioners to overcome many diseases which are now looked upon as hopeless. Those who love truth for her own sake will carefully avoid all asperity towards those with whom they differ in doctrine and practice; for it is no sign of a lover of truth, that his zeal vents itself in detraction, and hatred of those who do not think as he does. There never can be perfect agreement among medical men, it is useless to look for it; but there can and should be courtesy between those who differ, and a free interchange of sentiments on proper occasions, with confidence in each other's integrity, would lead to a better state of feeling, and cause a rapid progression in the science and art of medicine. The duties of the physician are too important to the comforts of life to be thought of and treated with lightness and disrespect. If human health and life are of value, then the physician's calling is of corresponding value. A mistake on his part might result in premature death, which, under some circumstances, would change the entire prospects of a large family, so that ages could not repair the derangement caused by one untimely death. We may be thought too enthusiastic because we are of those of whom we write; but for ourself, we freely declare, that rather than feel a less measure of the responsibility of the position which, in the order of Divine providence, we are placed in, we would prefer to feel an hundredfold increase of it. We would be

most happy if we could in any way aid in the great and necessary ceremony of "burying the hatchet" among the profession, that we might love as brethren, and for ever cease to make mouths at one another, or call names, or resort to any of the thousand ways by which detraction can be accomplished.

Physicians are thought to be, and justly, too, an enlightened class of men; but by some means the spirit of jealousy and of envy has got in among them, and has well nigh worked them out of the confidence of the people. By a little calm reflection each one will see for himself the errors into which the profession have fallen; and will also perceive how the evil is to be removed. Not by conventions and collective resolutions, but each man for himself should cultivate meekness, gentleness, patience, industry, perseverance and honesty. Thereby the loss which the profession has met with, in consequence of these things, will after awhile be regained. Controversy amounts to but little. Few, very few, are ever convinced by it. It only breeds strife and ill feeling. It causes cliques and parties founded upon nothing but heated passions, or some supposed principle which they mistakingly think they are in duty bound to defend, even to the knife. No progress can be made in scientific discoveries by any one who allows his passions to govern him, especially when they expend themselves upon an opponent whose purpose is equally honest with his own, and perhaps more so. Coercion or an attempt at it by law or party influence can never be promotive of scientific investigations. The mind should be free; and the CREATOR designed, as every man feels within himself, perfect freedom of mental labor in scientific pursuits. There can be no natural aristocracy in this; all are free; all are equal to labor in this field and promulgate the results of their labor; and all who properly know their calling and true relation to their fellows, will never for a moment feel, much less show, any indication of the dark spirits of envy, jealousy or detraction, but, on the contrary, manifest that noble spirit of approbation and encouragement to every one who casts, if it be but a mite, into the treasury of medical knowledge.

THE YELLOW FEVER.

The yellow fever is ravaging Martinique, Guadaloupe, and Barbadoes. From the reports, it is of the malignant type, *Typhus icterodes*. Bleeding, leeches, *Calomel*, *Tartar Emetic*, etc., etc., have been of no avail. Why do not the doctors try Homœopathy?

HOW TO JUDGE OF A SYSTEM OF MEDICINE.

When a person dies under homœopathic treatment the event is sometimes regarded by the unthinking as evidence that that system of medicine is unsafe, uncertain, and unworthy of confidence. The want of proper reflection and good judgment under such circumstances may lead to not only an illogical, but an absurd conclusion. Common observation teaches that few, very few, die of *old age*; but death comes to the young and to the middle-aged also, under every variety of condition, and almost in every instance unexpectedly, "as a thief in the night." And we have the Divine sanction for the wisdom of such an arrangement. It does not follow, therefore, that the death of an individual is of itself evidence of an erroneous medical treatment, for it is known that a person may die under the very best and live under the very worst; for this reason, it is not always that a recovery or a death proves anything of the appropriateness of the treatment. Previously to a conclusion being drawn from such premises, that shall be true and just, a great deal of knowledge is necessary, much more, in some cases, than falls to the lot of man to possess; with, then, the proper qualification in knowledge, honesty and skill, all the facts should be ascertained by a thorough investigation of the individual case; and then, by strict logical reasoning, a tolerably accurate conclusion may be reached in some instances. But when sympathy, prejudice, grief, or any passion, controls the mind, especially in those who, under the most favorable circumstances, are incompetent to judge of the matter, an opinion from such a source is of no value; but, on the contrary, it may do great harm both to a true system of medicine, and to its able and faithful practitioner.

But let it be borne in mind that it does not by any manner of means follow, from what we have said above, that we are not to judge of a system of medicine from individual experience of its effects in the restoration of health, in the mitigation of human sufferings and prolongation of life in incurable cases; but such judgment, to be just, must be formed from numerous cases in all the varieties of disease, in the hands of numerous educated and skilful practitioners, the treatment being based upon clearly defined laws existing in nature. If Allopathy and Homœopathy be tried by these rules, it will not be difficult to determine which is worthy of confidence.

HOMŒOPATHY.

At a meeting of the Connecticut Homœopathic Society, held at the office of Dr. Norton, in Bridgeport, on the 16th ult., an amended constitution was reported and adopted, several reports of cases were made, a paper was read by Dr. Keep on the Prevention of Disease, and the following officers were chosen:

President—J. T. Denison, M.D., of Fairfield.

Vice-President—W. W. Rodman, M.D., of Waterbury.

Secretary—G. S. Greer, M.D., of Hartford.

Treasurer—C. H. Skiff, M.D., of New Haven.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, the Connecticut Medical Society unanimously adopted the late report of Dr. Worthington Hooker, on the "Treatment due to Homœopathic Practitioners," and thereby sanctioned the position, "that if a physician should think that the alled principle *similia similibus curantur*, (which was definitely advanced by Stahl a century before Hahnemann made it the basis of his system) applies as an explanation of some of the phenomena developed in the treatment of disease, or if he should think that homœopaths have brought to our notice some remedies which are of value, such opinions do by no means make him a homœopathist, or subject him to discipline"—therefore

Resolved, 1st. That we regard these positions with gratification, believing them to be the first recognition from such a source of the possibility that the homœopathic principle, and the remedies it has brought into notice, may merit anything better than obliquy and contempt.

2d. That we will bear with composure

the mode in which we are personally treated, even though to have fellowship with us and to regard us "as brethren" be deemed an offence worthy of "discipline," if we may hope for better treatment for our principles, satisfied if the cause of truth is advanced by investigation, either within or without the pale of our ranks.

3d. That as the leading principle of our system and its remedies are thus recognized as legitimate subjects for investigation, we trust they will not henceforth be stigmatised as "Quackery," but that such opprobrious epithets will (if used at all) be reserved for dishonest practice, in whatever mode, and especially for those practitioners who make use of or vend secret and pretended nostrums.

4th. That we view with pleasure the increased attention bestowed upon Homœopathy, feeling assured that a candid estimate of its history, its principles and its remedies, will, ere long, lead others to that respect and confidence with which we regard them.

EVERY MAN AND EVERY WOMAN A DOCTOR.

It is, to our mind, a hard task to remove from the minds of the people the numerous erroneous notions which, for ages, have been gradually accumulating by the doctrines and practice of Hippocrates and his followers. Of all that concerns us in this life, no one thing is more difficult to understand and practise than the proper treatment of the sick. Yet so familiar have the people become with unmeaning technicalities used to express the nature of diseases, and with various unnumbered and not at all known compounds put up by practitioners, regular and irregular, for the cure of diseases by name, or advised on account of fancy speculations in regard to the nature and cause of human maladies; that from the good old lady who earns her bread by the sweat of her brow over the wash-tub, to the most intellectual and refined one of "elegant leisure," there is no hesitation in giving a prompt and positive opinion of any case of disease they may see or hear of, and with equal promptness and no thought advise medicine, as if the treatment of diseases were the easiest thing in the world, and not the result of education and experience, founded on fixed principles, difficult of application even by the most skilful. This ignorance, this gross

ignorance of medicine, has been accumulating so long that it has become almost a proverb that the art of healing "comes by nature." The allopathic school complains bitterly of quacks and quackery, but these evils lay at its own door, for both have been manufactured in that school.

Homœopathic Manual of Obstetrics; or, A Treatise on the Aid the Art of Midwifery may derive from Homœopathy. By DR. C. CROSERIO, of Paris. From the French, by M. COTE, M.D. Published by Moore, Anderson, Wilstack and Keys. Cincinnati, O. 1852, pp. 153, 12mo.

We have given but a hurried examination of this Manual, but the high standing of Dr. Croserio in the Homœopathic School makes it only necessary to have it known that he is the author of the above work, to induce each practitioner of our school to seek a copy of it without delay. We perceive it is one of those few practical works which will aid practitioners at the bedside of the sick. Having had in our day no small experience on the various subjects treated of in the volume before us, we confess our vanity is a little excited, in seeing Dr. Croserio advance our own views, and inculcate in the main our own practice, which we know has been successful. The volume under notice may seem to be insignificant because it contains only 153 pages; but our readers can hardly conceive the amount of information which the author has contrived in the clearest manner to express in a few words. The chief recommendation of the work is, that the practice is purely homœopathic. We have not perceived any allopathic measures, or, as some of our English homœopaths have it, "auxiliaries," advised. We hope the publishers will have this Manual on sale in this city. It is beautifully got up.

PROFESSOR A. E. SMALL's introductory lecture to the class of the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania, delivered October 14th, 1852, and published by the Class, has been received. This lecture is a brief exposition and defence of Homœopathy, and does credit to its author.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth.

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, JANUARY, 1853.

NO. 9.

S. R. KIRBY, M.D., EDITOR.

ON THE OBSERVATIONS OF NATURE IN THE TREATMENT OF DISEASE.

BY ANDREW COMBE, M.D.

*Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of
Edinburgh, one of the Physicians in Ordinary
in Scotland, to the Queen, &c., &c.*

[Concluded from page 116].

It is true that as yet we know so little of the course and tendencies of many forms of disease, that we might often be at a loss what treatment to adopt; but the clear recognition of our ignorance is the first step towards the acquisition of knowledge, and more enlightened observation would gradually remove the obscurity which at present prevails.

If any of these remarks should be considered by some to imply a want of faith in professional aid, I have only to reply that no conclusion can be more unfounded. With all its imperfections on its head, medicine, in the hands of discriminating and experienced men, seems to me already to be the source of the greatest benefits to suffering humanity. When cultivated with more constant reference to sound principles, it will become still more beneficial in its applications. It is a deep conviction of this truth which makes me so desirous to assist in the good work of medical improvement to which you are now devoting yourself.

It would be easy for me, were it needful, to point out numerous instances in practice, in which medicines were prescribed without reference to any guiding principle, or natural tendency in the system at the time, and in which, consequently, results ensued which were wholly unexpected. In this respect I cannot exempt myself from the censure I have bestowed upon other practitioners; and I must further admit that, even after I became fully alive to the importance of endeavouring on all occasions to act as the assistant and interpreter of nature in the treatment of disease, I continued to meet with many cases in which I could not discover what the real order of nature was, and in which, consequently, I was obliged to resort to purely empirical treatment, and with necessarily varying success. But even then I had this advantage on my side, that

the abiding consciousness under which I lived of nature's presence and power inspired me with watchfulness for the observation of her earliest indications, and induced me in the meantime to borrow all the aid I could from her, by placing the various bodily functions, as far as possible, under the conditions most favourable for their healthy operation. When doing so, I have sometimes been rewarded by the gradual disappearance of difficulties which seemed at first irremediable, and by an amount of improvement which served to increase my faith in the restorative powers of nature even under unfavourable circumstances.

The one great principle; then, to which a comprehensive review of Homœopathy, "Allopathy," Hydropathy, and all other systems of medicine, seems irresistibly to lead is, that, in all cases and on all occasions, *nature is truly the agent in the cure of disease; and that, as she acts in accordance with fixed and invariable laws, the aim of the physician ought always to be to facilitate her efforts, by acting in harmony with, and not in opposition to, those laws.* Disease, as already remarked, is a mode of action of a living organism, and not an entity apart from it. In accordance with this view, experience shows that when we favour the return to a normal action by simply natural means, recovery will ensue in most cases, without the use of drugs at all. So far from being always necessary to a cure, drugs are required only where the power of nature to resume her normal action proves inadequate or is impeded by a removable obstruction. Even then, it is still nature acting in accordance with her own laws that brings about the cure. She may be aided, but *she ought never to be thwarted*; and medicine will advance towards the certainty of other sciences only in proportion as we become saturated with this guiding principle.

A few words now on Homœopathy in particular. I am very glad that you have brought the question of its truth and merits seriously before your readers; for, of all methods of advancing the interests of science, that which consists in the supercilious neglect of alleged new discoveries, merely on the ground that they differ from what is already known, is assuredly the worst. We

know far too little of the constitution of nature, and more especially of animated nature, to be able to decide *a priori* what can or cannot be true regarding the mode in which vital operations are conducted, or in which they may be modified by external influences. Medicine itself is in its very essence an estimative science, and the truth of the principles on which it rests can be ascertained or verified only by careful and extensive observation. Theoretically, these principles may be rendered more or less probable in the eye of reason, but they never can be demonstrated except by an appeal to experience. Medicine, moreover, considered as a system or body of doctrine, is still at the best in a very defective state. Every page of your Review admits and laments this unfortunate truth. We ought, therefore, to extend the hand of welcome to every man who is able either to correct an established error, or add a new truth to the existing store; and much more so, if the offered contribution should be that of a new and important principle capable, if true, of modifying and improving the whole field of medical practice. Not that we are by any means called upon to run after and examine every new theory or alleged discovery in medicine, merely because it is announced to be such. If we did, we should impose upon ourselves a never-ending and most useless task. But surely we are bound not to be too rash in rejecting, without examination, facts and principles which come before us, attested by men of experience, skill, and integrity, and who can have no motive for deceiving us. Judged of by the standard of our own opinions, these facts and principles may seem at first sight to be altogether absurd; but, if so, the question then comes to be, is our standard itself undoubtedly a correct one? Or may it not be that ignorance has misled us to adopt it as infallible, and that it would be wiser in us to compare both it and the alleged discoveries with nature before assuming either to be demonstrably true? Had this reasonable course been followed with the discoveries of Harvey, Jenner and Gall, how much idle and acrimonious disputation and professional obloquy might have been avoided, and how many benefits might have been obtained which were lost for years to suffering humanity, by the opposite course of first rejecting and ridiculing, and then examining evidence only when compelled to do so by a humiliating, because tardy and ungracious, necessity.

Let not this wholesome lesson, then, be lost to us who are the living successors of those who acted so unwisely. To use your own words, Homœopathy, whether true or false, comes before us for examination with "claims on our attention which cannot be gainsayed." It is, you say, an ingenious system, "professing to be based on a most

formidable array of facts and experiments," and "woven into a complete code of doctrine with singular dexterity and much apparent fairness." Its discoverer and chief cultivators are, as you believe, "sincere, honest, and learned men." Dr. Fleischmann, perhaps the most eminent among them, is considered by you as "a regular, well-educated physician, as capable of forming a true diagnosis as other practitioners," and as "a man of honour and respectability," whose testimony as to matters of fact "you cannot therefore refuse to admit." Even in acute diseases, the results of his treatment are such as "would have been considered as satisfactory by any candid physician;" and, according to you, even his own narrative affords ample evidence that many of his cases *were* severe; and you candidly add that this was confirmed to you by the private testimony of a competent physician who followed his practice for three months, and himself traced the progress of the pneumonic cases by careful auscultation through all their stages up to perfect recovery, which took place in as short a time as under the most energetic treatment. In some eruptive and febrile diseases, the mortality is stated by you to have been below the ordinary rate. Let us scout quacks and pretenders as we may, here is surely too strong a *prima facie* case to warrant our dismissing it with mere ridicule and contempt, and one which amply justifies you in the course you have adopted of seriously investigating its claims. I am aware that you have been blamed by many for occupying your pages with even a refutation of "such trash;" but so far from participating in this feeling, my chief objection to your review is that it does not go far enough to be *conclusive*, either for or against Homœopathy. You have admitted too much, and denied too much, to warrant your either pronouncing a definitive sentence or reposing in *mere opinion* against its truth. Had you shown that the general results of its practice were *less* favourable than those of ordinary medicine, you might legitimately have held yourself absolved from going further; but in your present position you can no longer stand still. If, as you admit, the truth of Homœopathy is a *question of fact and experience*, which no mere argument can set aside, you are bound in reason and in logic to *test its facts* for yourself before pronouncing authoritatively that it is not true, and more especially before stigmatising it as "useless to the sufferer and degrading to the physician." However improbable its doctrines and practice may be in an *a priori* point of view, it is not by argument or ridicule that its alleged stronghold of facts can be successfully assailed. As a *matter of theory*, supported only by argument, Homœopathy produces no conviction whatever on my mind of its truth, or even of its probability:

but as a *question of fact*, claiming to rest "on the irresistible ground of its superior power of curing diseases and preserving human life," and on the alleged experience of able and honest men, as competent to judge as most of those who oppose them, I cannot venture to denounce it as untrue, because I have no experience bearing especially upon it to bring forward, and we are still too ignorant to be able to predicate *a priori* what may or may not be true in the great field of nature. But after the presumptive evidence which you yourself have produced, if I were now in practice I should hold myself bound, without further delay, to test its truth by careful and extensive experiments; because, where truth is really our aim, the shortest and least encumbered approach to it is always the best; and even a few well-defined and carefully observed facts would carry far more weight, as *items* of evidence, than volumes of general or controversial reasoning. In instituting such an inquiry, however, we ought to be prepared to lay aside prejudice, and to scrutinise facts with the fairness and liberality characteristic of a love of truth, and not regard them with dislike and distrust, as if they were as many live embers purposely laid down to burn our fingers the moment we touched them. View the question as we may, *one of three things must be*: either Homœopathy is true, or it is false, or it is a mixture of truth and error. Let us suppose the worst, and hold it to be false in its foundation, and false in its superstructure, what harm can result from putting it to the test, and ascertaining the fact demonstrably? None whatever, but, on the contrary, much good. We shall at least have gained the power of giving a direct and authoritative negative to its allegations, which we shall then prove to be fallacious, and which have been suffered to reign and diffuse themselves for thirty years from the absence of direct counter-evidence by which to rebut them. We shall thus be able also to put the profession and the public on their guard with some chance of being listened to, and shall have obtained the inestimable advantage of keeping our own minds open to the admission of new truths, and of showing that in our estimate of evidence, and in our conclusions, we are actuated not by any mean jealousy or dogmatic assumption of authority, but by the single and simple desire of advancing the interests of science and humanity to the best of our ability. The *very worst* that can happen in the event of its being wholly untrue is, that we shall have bestowed some time and pains in obtaining the means of more effectually putting down a great error; while, as a compensating advantage of no small value, we shall have at once increased our knowledge and cultivated and strengthened our intellectual and moral faculties, by the very nature of the

mental exercise which such a scrutiny requires; and surely these will be rewards well worth all the time and trouble which they may cost us.

If we adopt the supposition that Homœopathy embodies an *admixture of truth and error*, the inducement to institute a rigid and careful inquiry into its claims becomes still more imperative, that we may obtain possession of the one, and carefully avoid the other. The degree of success, be it more or less, which all admit to attend Homœopathic practice, as conducted by such men as Fleischmann, is sufficient to show that either the system or its advocates possess *some* advantages in the treatment of disease, which it would be useful for ordinary practitioners also to examine and adopt. Whether the means which afford these advantages be derived from the domain of hygiene, of *materia medica*, or even of the imagination, is of comparatively little practical consequence, provided *their utility to the patient and the best mode of reproducing and applying them to the treatment of disease* can be clearly established. This, however, can be done only by careful investigation, and that such investigation would be amply rewarded may fairly be presumed, from the good already effected by Homœopathy in demonstrating the evils attendant on that over-active medication which characterises so much especially of English practice. Ordinary medicine is now not nearly so heroic and undiscriminating in the use of strong measures as it was some years ago, and this improvement is unquestionably due in part to the progress of Homœopathy, as well as to the natural increase of our knowledge.

The remaining, although unlikely, supposition, viz., that Homœopathy shall prove to be *essentially true* in its fundamental principle, and consequently fraught with benefits to science and humanity, as its advocates affirm it to be, need not detain us more than a moment. *If true*, how much more shall we then have reason to rejoice that we did not look upon its claims with prejudiced eyes, or reject and condemn it unheard and unexamined! Had Harvey's detractors examined his facts first, and then given their verdict, how different would the results have been to themselves, to him, and to mankind! And yet in our own day the profession acted towards Jenner, and also towards Gall, as if Harvey's name and memory had been blotted from the page of history.

I press all these considerations upon you, not from any particular leaning towards Homœopathy, or any other new and disputed branch of knowledge, but because of the transcendent importance of cultivating science in a right spirit, and offering truth a ready and unprejudiced welcome from whatever quarter it may come. Ridicule and

declamation may be rightfully employed to explode errors *after they shall have been proved to be so*; but they are most unfit instruments for the primary investigation of truth, and as such ought to be banished for ever from scientific discussion, and a candid spirit of philosophical inquiry be instituted in their room. I have had no personal experience of Homœopathy, and am consequently, as little inclined to admit as to reject its claims, but I should wish to steer clear of prejudices regarding it. There are perhaps a few analogies in its favour, but its doctrinal expositions embody much that is crude and contradictory, and most of its practical evidence, in the shape of published cases, is rendered nugatory by the same sources of doubt which render so much of professional experience and testimony inconclusive, if not worthless. Sufficient discrimination is not used, or if used not recorded, to warrant much reliance on the alleged connection between the remedy and the recovery in individual cases. As in ordinary medicine, the *post hoc* is too universally assumed to imply the *propter hoc*. If I am not mistaken, the more intelligent Homœopathists themselves admit this, and in consequence do not claim *belief* on the ground of the recorded cases, but affirm that, on the contrary, rational belief can be produced only by personal and extensive experience. But, while I refuse belief, I can see no reason for that deadly hostility which many feel towards the principle of Homœopathy. If it be true, such hostility is misplaced and injurious. If false, it is needless and supererogatory; for the hostility will vanish with the non-existence or destruction of its object. And, after all, why should either party delight in representing Homœopathy and ordinary medicine as *in every respect* opposed to each other? In a large proportion of cases, the more rational and enlightened men of both parties employ the very same hygienic and general means which we have already seen to act so large a part in effecting recovery; and the chief difference between them relates to the principle on which the requisite medicine is to be selected. The Homœopathist prescribes according to the principle of *similia similibus*, because experience, he says, proves this to be the safest and most efficacious plan. The ordinary practitioner, on the other hand, prescribes that which rational, or it may be routine, experience has led him to believe the best adapted for cases of the kind before him; and without stopping to inquire whether its action is homœopathic, allopathic, or antipathic. Surely there is no necessary cause of quarrel in all this, but merely results to be tested by careful experiment. "True," you may say, "but then the infinitesimal doses are so absurd." They certainly look very absurd; and I at once admit that nothing short of demonstration and personal evidence will

ever inspire me with a conviction of their power to do either good or harm. But then all Homœopathists say that it is the principle of *similia similibus*, and not the dose, which constitutes the essential element in their system, and that the infinitesimals may be discarded, and yet the great principle of Homœopathy remain unshaken. This latter, then, is the great fact to be proved or disproved, to settle the question for ever; and why should it not be put to the test? Let experiments be made on a sufficient number of healthy persons with quinine, or any other drug, to ascertain whether it really has the property ascribed to it of exciting certain groups of symptoms in a sound constitution, and, after carefully varying and repeating the experiments, faithfully record and publish the results. Surely there is nothing unphilosophical or undignified in instituting such an inquiry, and nothing so difficult as not to be easily overcome by judgment and patience. Having tried their action in health, try the same remedies *in the usual doses* in the treatment of disease with as much care and discrimination as possible, and again record the results. If the principle holds good, let us adopt it, and be thankful we have now a surer guide than before. If it fails, our exposure of its fallacy will tell with tenfold effect, from being founded on direct experience. In the same way with the infinitesimal doses, let us go at once to facts, and leave mere disputation to the idle speculator. All truth is harmonious, and what is true in the one system must harmonise with and throw light upon what is true in the other, and, consequently, it would be better for science were both parties to endeavour to find out the points of contact rather than those of repulsion. In the very nature of things, certainty or absolute identity of opinion is, and ever must remain, an impossibility; and it ought never to be forgotten that in this respect there is a radical difference between medical and physical science. Physical science is *fixed* and *positive* in its principles and in its details, because its facts are always accessible for examination under the same conditions, or under such variations as can easily be traced and allowed for. Medicine, on the contrary, is and ever must be an *estimative* science, because its facts and phenomena are subject to continual variations from varying states of the body and mind of the patient, which we can neither control nor appreciate with entire accuracy. Its cultivators, too, are men differing in intellectual power, knowledge, skill, and experience; and even, if they were all equal, their judgment is constantly liable to be impaired or disturbed by any slight disturbance of health or excitement of feeling, or even by a little extra fatigue; and hence, although its principles are fixed and determinate, because also founded on the laws of

nature, the soundness of the conclusions deduced from them for the guidance of treatment must ever depend on the soundness of the estimate formed by the physician of their operation and influence in the individual case. Very rarely, indeed, can they be absolute, and hence the wide field for the exercise of sound judgment, skill, and discrimination, on the part of the practitioner, and the mischief which may attend a practice founded on mere routine. Hence the forbearance and charitable construction which, as members of a liberal and useful, but most difficult profession, we are bound to exercise towards each other; and for the exercise of which there is, I fear, ample occasion in this very letter. But restrained as I have been by impaired health, as well as by the impossibility of doing full justice within your limited space to a subject at once so extensive and so important, I could not always express my opinions with the precision which I wished, and therefore I must trust to your good sense and right feeling not to give undue importance to any isolated or dubious expression which you may meet with, but to adopt that meaning which is in accordance with the general spirit of my remarks. My only anxiety has been to help you in the good work to which you have dedicated yourself with so much zeal, energy, and talent, and for which you will, I have no doubt, one day have your reward in a rich harvest of useful results.

I remain, my dear sir, very sincerely yours,
ANDREW COMBE.

A FEW THOUGHTS ON CONSUMPTION.

THE deaths by consumption, as proved by the weekly bills of mortality, are more numerous than by any other disease. The profession seems to act as if every case of consumption were incurable; and consequently the same unsuccessful treatment is pursued, and oftener, much oftener, than is imagined, medication itself becomes the cause of a more fatal rapidity than would take place, if the disease were left undisturbed in its natural course. This opinion was expressed to us recently, by one of the oldest and ablest old school physicians of this city.

It is believed by the profession that *tubercular consumption* is an hereditary complaint. It is not difficult to know those who are likely to be predisposed to this malady. If, on inquiry, there be reasonable grounds to infer such predisposition, then it becomes the duty of the physician to avoid altogether, or if absolutely indicated, to administer with great caution certain

drugs which directly tend to awake a slumbering *phthisis pulmonalis*. There are such drugs, and in common use too, which we will try to prove, or present what is so near positive evidence, that few impartial minds can resist the conviction that our views on this subject are true.

Mercury, whether in the form of blue pills or calomel, is, perhaps, the most likely to develop *tubercles*. This mineral has been so extensively and universally used in all kinds of diseases, that its effects in the human system should be better understood than any other drug. The symptoms which follow are mercurial symptoms, ascertained by trials on numerous healthy persons. It will be noticed how strikingly similar the symptoms of *mercury* are to those of cases of *tubercular phthisis*.

The observation of experienced physicians, and the pathogenesis of that mineral should settle the question under notice.

Mercury will cause in healthy persons, when administered in moderate doses, and often repeated: "Great fatigue, weakness, and rapid loss of strength; frequent trembling, even after the least exertion; fainting fits; emaciation and atrophy of the whole body; at night restlessness, agitation and tossing; heat or sweat; palpitation of the heart, short respiration; heat in the face and head, with redness of the cheeks. Copious weakening sweats, day and night, and in the morning; stitches in the side; face pale; ulceration of the gums; entire loss of speech; painful dryness of the throat; inflammatory redness and swelling of the back parts of the mouth and throat; insatiable appetite and craving; great weakness of digestion, with continued hunger, and pressure in the stomach; risings, principally after eating; and often a putrid, or bitter, or sour and rancid taste, violent and empty risings; excessive sensibility in the stomach and in the pericardial region; tension, fullness, and pressure as from a stone in the pit of the stomach, principally during or after a meal, however little may have been eaten; suppression of the catamenia; catamenia too copious, with uneasiness and colic; purulent corrosive leucorrhœa, with itching in the parts; continual hoarseness and loss of voice; dry cough, sometimes fatiguing and shaking, principally in bed, in the evening or at night. Cough excited by tickling, or

a sense of dryness in the chest. Cough aggravated by speaking. Cough as if caused by irritation in the stomach. Cough, with expectoration of pure blood; difficult respiration as from want of breath. Shortness of breath when going up stairs, and when walking quickly. Anxious oppression of the chest and difficulty of respiration. When lying on the left side attacks of suffocation. Lancinations in the chest, principally when coughing. Sharp pains in the shoulders, especially when moving."

Now, if *Mercury* can thus influence the healthy human organism, it is fair to infer, even in the absence of all other proof, that its effects must be pernicious in those who have an undeveloped *tubercular* disease, for that disease, in its natural course in some persons, would present symptoms similar to those of *Mercury*. We do not mean to be understood as saying, that *Mercury* is not admissible even in the treatment of *tubercular phthisis*. When it is homœopathic to a case, it should be administered; but in a high attenuation—the 30th, 50th, or 100th. We have seen, more than once, a single dose of the first trituration of mercury given to a person with developed *tubercles*, cause alarming diminution of strength, and copious sweat in a few hours. It cannot be estimated how extensive the mischief is, that is caused by the ordinary allopathic doses of mercury.

We shall continue this subject and notice the effects of Quinine and the Peruvian Bark on consumptive persons.

PHENOMENA AND THEORY OF INFLAMMATION,

IN CONNECTION WITH HOMŒOPATHIC STATISTICS.

By JOHN OZANNE, M.D.

(Continued from page 95.)

IV.

The opinion that the white corpuscles of the blood are increased in inflammation is based chiefly upon the following grounds:

"1st. The accumulation of colourless corpuscles within the vessels of an inflamed part.

"2nd. The large quantity of colourless corpuscles contained in the liquor sanguinis, which, in blood drawn in inflammation, rises to the top to form the buffy coat" (W. Jones, loc. cit.).

With reference to the first point, we have brought forward the authority of Mr. Wharton Jones and of Mr. Paget, to prove that the white corpuscles of the blood are not usually increased in inflamed blood in the human subject, and that, when increased, the increase does not depend upon the inflammatory process. We might add here the authority of Dr. J. Hughes Bennett, who has performed experiments with the view of ascertaining the truth of this part of the theory of Dr. Williams and Mr. Addison. He looks upon it as totally devoid of foundation. "He thinks that the above-named physiologists may have been deceived by the rendering distinct the nuclei of the epidermic cells in the web of the frog's foot; *which nuclei* closely resemble the colourless blood-corpuscles" (Ranking's Abstract, vol. v. p. 185).

Thus far we have found that no augmentation of the white corpuscles of the blood has been proved to exist in the blood *whilst circulating in its vessels*. The case is different when we approach the second point, namely, "the large quantity of colourless corpuscles contained in the liquor sanguinis, which, in blood drawn in inflammation, rises to the top to form the buffy coat."

The increase is distinctly stated by the different observers, and the statement is founded upon the direct observation of the human blood itself. Here, then, is no source of fallacy, such as has been pointed out—no inference from the frog to the human subject.

But the question here presents itself—what is the character of these white corpuscles? are they of the same nature as those observed in the vessels or in blood just drawn from them?

Mr. Gulliver (App. to Gerber, p. 15) states that M. Mandl seems to have been the first to notice the presence of the white globules in the blood of mammalia, and that he considers "that they are produced by the coagulation of the fibrin, and that this coagulation is necessarily attended by the formation of these globules." Hence he calls them *fibrinous globules*. "He moreover states that these globules are never found in the circulation, but are formed and may be seen to augment in number on the port-object of the microscope; and Mr. Phillips adopts this view of the subject."

Further on (p. 18) we find the following: "M. Piorry has described in the buffy coat of the blood, greyish granulations, about as big as poppy or hempseeds, which granulations were best seen by transmitted light (*contre-jour*);" and Mr. Addison has lately given some observations on "Colourless Globules of the Buffy Coat of the Blood," which, it appears, were detected with a common lens. "On dipping the point of the finger," says Mr. Addison, "on the surface (of the buffy coat) before coagulation had taken place, a clear colourless drop adhered to it, which, when transferred to

piece of glass and examined by a common lens, against the light, was found to contain an immense multitude of clear colourless globules." In the next page, Mr. Gulliver says of M. Mandl, that he dissents from the opinion of Professor Muller, that the isolated white globules of the blood of frogs are lymph-globules. M. Mandl regards the white globules "as identical with the fibrinous globules which are formed on the port-object of the microscope, and never seen in the circulating blood."

We believe that these different quotations are already sufficient to raise a doubt whether the authors who have written on the white corpuscles of the blood, have not in general confounded together two sets of globules, different in their appearance and in their mode of origin. It is tolerably evident that the *fibrinous globules* of M. Mandl cannot be the same as the white corpuscles found in the blood by other physiologists. For he states that they are never found in it, but form by coagulation, when on the glass-plate under the microscope. After a careful examination of all the recorded facts bearing upon this question, which we could find, we have come to the conclusion that there are two distinct orders of pale corpuscles to be observed in the human blood (*besides* the very fine granules or molecules described by Mr. Gulliver): first, the white corpuscles circulating with the blood in its vessels; and, secondly, the white corpuscles observed only in blood which has escaped from its vessels in exudations, or which has been artificially drawn from it; most of the latter forming by the process of coagulation which takes place. We also believe that these consist of fibrin.

We have stated our conclusions beforehand, in order that the following observations of M. Andral might be better understood. They are, in our opinion, deserving of close attention, for we deem them to be quite conclusive.

M. Andral found, on examining blood just drawn, that the red corpuscles appeared perfectly regular and their edges well defined; but these soon became granulated (like a raspberry), festooned, and in some cases assumed the appearance of a cogged wheel. At the same time, the white corpuscles which M. Andral had observed in the blood, previously to this change of appearance of the red corpuscles, became rarer as this change progressed and became more conspicuous. He ascribes this phenomenon to the deposition of the white corpuscles (which he has previously described in fresh-drawn blood) upon the red corpuscles.

"In following attentively," says he, "all the movements of displacement which took place at the focus of the instrument, I was enabled to watch the mode of production of this phenomenon, and to see the white corpuscles approach the red globules, de-

posit upon their surfaces, adhere to their edges, and form thus all the possible varieties of granulated and festooned globules. This granulated aspect, which some have considered as the indication of a commencement of destruction, and others as the result of a pathological influence, is then, after all, only the product of the precipitation of the white corpuscles around the red globules" (*Hématologie Pathologique*, pp. 32, 33).

Now, it must be observed that these phenomena were observed in healthy blood. M. Andral, unlike many other observers, thought it necessary, in his researches upon the blood, to vary his experiments, and to repeat them, under the greatest possible variety of circumstances, *both in health and disease*. Thus, of the microscopical examination of the blood, he says:—"This examination must be made with much care and during a long time for healthy blood, before we can think of studying by means of the microscope the alterations which the liquid may have suffered" in disease (*op. cit.*, p. 30).

Let us now turn to his examination of the blood in inflammation.

"Scarcely had the yellowish and opaline liquid, which constitutes its first rudiments (of the buffy coat), shown itself above the mass of globules, than we placed a drop of it in the focus of the microscope; then, independently of a few red globules, the field of vision of the instrument seemed to us to be full of these granular corpuscles, of which I have previously endeavoured to determine the nature" (*op. cit.*, p. 77).

Now, what is the nature of these white corpuscles? They are found to exist in the buffy coat of inflammatory blood; they are also found in healthy blood; moreover, they are found in the semi-transparent and almost oleaginous stratum which forms on the surface of the blood, constantly and normally in the horse, but only in certain pathological conditions in man.

We thus find that whereas in healthy human blood a number of white corpuscles are to be found soon after it is drawn from the vessels, the surface stratum which is about to form the buffy coat in the blood of the horse in the healthy state, and of man in inflammation, contains a much larger number, for the field of vision is full of them. Now, it has not been proved that white corpuscles are more numerous in the blood of the horse than in that of other animals. These pale corpuscles must, then, be the produce of *coagulation*, as held by M. Mandl.

But the proof of this and of the fibrinous nature of these corpuscles does not rest upon a mere inference alone, however sound it may be. Direct experiments have pronounced in its favor.

"But what is the *nature* of these white corpuscles? Here a general fact presents itself. Whenever the blood, just as it issues

from the blood-vessels, is examined, the existence of isolated white corpuscles is first ascertained, and next the granulated or festooned appearance of a certain number of red globules. When, on the contrary, by any means whatever, *the blood is deprived of all its fibrin before its spontaneous coagulation, no white corpuscles are any longer found in the focus of the microscope, neither do the red globules any longer present either the granular or the festooned aspect*" (Andral, op. cit., p. 33). "*The presence of the fibrin is then necessary, in order that the drop of blood may contain white corpuscles, and without these the alteration of the red globules cannot take place*" (p. 34).

This experiment is decisive as to the nature of these white corpuscles. They are fibrinous, and they are produced either soon after the blood is drawn or in the act of its being removed from its vessels, for they have never been seen in it, although granules much smaller than are these corpuscles have been seen in the blood, either stagnant or circulating slowly in the blood-vessels.

We have still to state the relation in which these corpuscles stand to those in our former papers. In the first place, they are different from the white or lymph-corpuscles to which Dr. Williams alludes, and to which he ascribes the obstruction in the vessels of inflamed parts. Dr. Williams's white corpuscles, as delineated in his diagram (already cited), are nearly as large, as large or much larger than the flat blood-disks which circulate with them in the vessels. Mr. Gulliver, who has made numerous measurements of the blood-corpuscles in man and many mammalia, as well as in *batrachia* and *invertebrata*, gives the diameter of the white globules as 1-2800th of an inch; the diameter of the red corpuscles being 1-3300th of an inch.

Now, M. Andral has measured the white corpuscles described in his "*Hématologie Pathologique*," and states their diameter to be 1-500th of a millimeter, the red globules being 1-110th to 1-120th of a millimeter; the diameter of the latter being more than four times that of the white corpuscles, which he has proved to be fibrin, and which accumulated in the buffy coat of inflammatory blood. It stands to reason that, if it were not so, the latter could not give to the former a granulated appearance like that of a raspberry or a festooned outline. In fractions of an English inch, M. Andral's white corpuscles are equivalent to about 1-12000th, whereas the large white corpuscles are equivalent to about 1-2800th of an inch. It is clear that, with these data, no confusion whatever can exist with reference to the respective characteristics or the nature of these two orders of white corpuscles.

It is singular that so late as the year 1846, Dr. Carpenter, in his "*Manual of Physiology*," should have overlooked these obser-

vations of M. Andral. That he had not read M. Andral's observations on the white corpuscles, published three years before, is evident, if we take into consideration what he says of them in his Manual.

"Thus, in the inflammatory process, the quantity of fibrin in the blood is greatly augmented, and the number of white corpuscles found in that fluid, when it is drawn from the body, is very largely increased. . . . Moreover, they are observed to accumulate in great numbers in the vessels of inflamed parts" (Manual of Physiology, p. 125).

It is thus evident that Dr. Carpenter confounds together both kinds of white corpuscles—the large ones, about as large or larger than the red corpuscles, and the small ones, less than one-fourth of the diameter of the red disks. Yet Dr. Carpenter depicts in his frontispiece the very mammillated or granulated appearance of the red corpuscles, which led M. Andral, in his attempt to explain them, and in his researches for that purpose, to such fruitful results.

We now find—these important points gained—first, the large white corpuscles are not usually increased in inflammation, and, if so, only in peculiar conditions; secondly, the number of minute white corpuscles is probably increased; thirdly, the latter, being formed of fibrin, *must* be increased, for the fibrin is known to be greatly increased in quantity in the blood in inflammation; and, lastly, we discover how it is that many pathologists have been led to suppose that the large white corpuscles are augmented in the blood in inflammatory disease.

Let us now sum up all that has been said with reference to the proportion of colourless corpuscles in the blood in inflammation.

I. There are two kinds of white corpuscles to be found in the blood, both in health and during the presence of inflammation:—

A. Large corpuscles, as large or larger than the red corpuscles. These are observed in the blood-vessels, as well as in the blood drawn from them.

B. Small corpuscles, the diameter of which is only one-fourth or one-fifth part of that of the red corpuscles. These are only observed in blood effused from its vessels into the surrounding tissues, or in blood drawn from them. They seem more especially to accumulate on the surface of the buffy coat during its coagulation in the healthy condition in the horse, and in the inflammatory condition in man.

II. The larger white corpuscles do not appear to be augmented in the blood at large, or in the blood-vessels of inflamed parts, in inflammations occurring in persons in an ordinary state of health; but they are found to be augmented in inflammations

occurring in weak and cachectic individuals.

III. The larger white corpuscles are not present in larger numbers in the blood-vessels of inflamed parts than in the vessels of healthy parts. Neither do they seem to be in any way the cause of obstruction in the vessels of inflamed parts.

IV. The smaller white corpuscles appear to be of a fibrinous nature, and to owe their origin to the coagulation of the fibrin of the blood.

V. They are found in healthy blood, but in larger quantities on the surface of the buffy coat during its coagulation.

VI. Since the proportion of fibrin has been proved to be much greater in the blood drawn during the existence of the inflammatory process than in that drawn in health, it is probable that the smaller white corpuscles are more numerous in the blood in inflammation than in health.

VII. But as these corpuscles have never been observed in the blood-vessels either in the healthy state or during diseases, they cannot produce any obstruction in them.

Let us now apply these data to the treatment of inflammation, and more especially to the question—Is blood-letting necessary in inflammatory disease?

Since the larger white corpuscles are neither so generally increased in inflammation as to render that increase a constituent part of the inflammatory process, and since it is found that they do not cause any obstruction of the vessels of inflamed parts, or add to it when it exists, it follows that *the removal of a portion of these corpuscles is not necessary. Hence there is no circumstance in the physical phenomena of inflammation requiring the abstraction of blood, or pointing to it as a desirable remedial measure.*

So far from the presence of the larger white corpuscles requiring the abstraction of blood, whatever may be their quantity, the observation of Bennett, "that the proportion of the colourless corpuscles is increased by abstraction of blood, and that the portions first drawn in inflammation contain very few," would, if the increase of the colourless corpuscles were still held to be the cause of obstruction of the vessels of inflamed parts, tend to show that *blood-letting can only be injurious in inflammation.*

But we do not wish at present to bring forward the latter conclusion. We are satisfied with having demonstrated that *there is no circumstance in the physical phenomena of inflammation, which tends in the least to show that blood-letting is either necessary or likely to be beneficial in the treatment of inflammatory diseases.*

Since the smaller white corpuscles are found to consist of fibrin, we shall say nothing of this fact with reference to the treatment of inflammation, at present; for

in our next paper we shall have to consider the alterations in *kind* and *quantity* of the constituents of the blood observed in inflammation; the principal of which is the marked augmentation of the proportion of fibrin.

(To be continued.)

ESTABLISHED RULES IN MEDICINE SHOULD BE STRICTLY FOLLOWED IN THE PRACTICE.

It is admitted, and deeply regretted by those competent to judge, that the healing art has not progressed like other branches of knowledge. For many hundreds of years it was virtually the same, with similar unsatisfactory results, as the bills of mortality indicated. At the moment when the ablest of the profession, here and there, ventured more than to insinuate their want of confidence in medicine, and some of these declared they had found better results, by doing little more than insisting on a strict observance of dietetical rules: at this period, Hahnemann, whose observations had led him to look upon allopathic practice as uncertain and unsafe, promulgated principles in medicine, and defended them by the most convincing proofs and arguments. Since then, these principles, which constitute the science of medicine, have been spreading, until the real or pretended disciples of that great man may be found in almost every city and large town in every country. The Homœopathic system is in itself nature's laws, which are clearly defined, and constitute the basis of a true healing art. Allopathy has no such laws; she pretends to rely on experience, in which, if her practitioners would be accurate in their observations, ample proof would be furnished to each investigator, of its pernicious tendency.

The people are not fully awake to this subject; and many who are influenced by allopathic teaching, think that that homœopathist who is not strict in his adherence to the rules of the art, shows a liberality consistent with the times; that he wisely avoids exclusiveness and the fanatical doctrine *ultraism*; and further, that such a loose kind of practice shows superior intelligence and judgment. Such sentiments are entertained by many, who of course have never for a moment questioned the soundness of their views. "I like that physician,"

said one, "who studies the good of his patients, and keeps himself out of a straight-jacket; who disregards rules of practice as occasion requires." This doctrine originated in quackery, and is perpetuated by those who do not seem to have examined the subject. We doubt if a physician can be found who does not, so far at least as intention is concerned, consult the good of his patients. The good of the sick can be consulted by the physician only by a strict observance of established rules of practice. Whatever pretense to that object there may be out of such rules, is a deception in the practitioner and also towards the sick.

A CASE OF NEURALGIA:

It sometimes requires a good deal of labor to select the remedies for individual cases of disease. The therapeutic law, and the pathogenesis of drugs seem plain enough in the abstract, but when used in practice, they are often attended with a good deal of perplexity. We were recently consulted by a young lady for a *neuralgia* of the left side of the head, face and neck, with which she had been afflicted nightly for nearly three weeks, and had employed various means for relief, but without effect. The pain came on daily at six o'clock P. M., and continued until four o'clock the following morning. This had been uniform, and the pain was very severe. We searched for the remedy for hours; and after examining all the more prominent drugs, concluded that *Belladonna* or *Nux Vomica* was indicated. At length we almost forced ourself into the belief that the former was the remedy, and gave it for two days without the slightest mitigation of the sufferings. We then resolved to examine the pathogenesis of other drugs not in such general use. And among these, *Guaiacum officinale*, almost word for word corresponded to the case as we had previously recorded its symptoms. Having at the time the 200th attenuation only, we gave three doses, at intervals of two hours while the pain prevailed, which caused a slight aggravation and a change in the hour of the attack to seven o'clock P. M., and terminating at one o'clock A. M. The *Guaiacum* 30th was given the next night every hour, but the aggravation caused the sufferings to be intolerable.

The pain ceased about three o'clock A. M. The following day and night we gave nothing, but the pain came on at 8 o'clock, P. M., and continued less violent until about one o'clock A. M. The next day we gave three doses of the same medicine, 30th attenuation, one every two hours between the paroxysms. The result was, no return of the pain; in a word, the patient was cured. *Guaiacum* has these symptoms, which were distinctly marked in the above case: "External headache, as if there were too much blood in the integuments of the head, and as if the head were swollen, when sitting. Pulsative throbbing in the outer parts of the head, with stitches in the temples, removed for a short while by external pressure, relieved by walking, increased by sitting or standing. Lancinations in the right cheek, as if knives were plunged in. Pain in the left side of the jaw." These symptoms, with others similar in character on the neck, which are not found in *Guaiacum*, were described with unusual accuracy by the patient; except that the sufferings were on the left side of the head, face and neck, bounded as if by a line drawn from the angle of the jaw, before the ear to the vertex; from thence to the tip of the nose and left nostril to the angle of the mouth; from thence over the jaw to the neck, affecting about one third of it.

We are thus particular, that the student in Homœopathy may have an example, how clearly the pathogenesis of drugs does sometimes correspond to the symptoms of disease; and also how prompt the curative effects when the medicine and the disease are brought within the therapeutic law. The symptoms of *Guaiacum* as above, it is recorded, took place on the right side of the head and face, which this case shows was of no importance when the character of the symptoms is so very like those of the disease it no doubt cured.

The Annual Meeting of the Homœopathic Medical Society of the State of New-York will be held at the City Hall in the City of Albany, on Tuesday, the 8th day of February, 1853, at 10 o'clock A. M.

HENRY D. PAINE, M.D.,
Secretary.

THE AGGRAVATION OF DISEASES BY THEIR REMEDIES SHOULD BE RECOGNISED.

We have often urged the importance of accuracy in the homœopathic treatment of diseases; in recording the symptoms; in selecting the remedy; in its preparation; in the size and repetition of the dose; and what is, we were about to write, of the greatest importance, to learn to recognise the re-action of the vital power from the impression made on it by the drug administered. This requires a close, long and patient scrutiny. If we could command the language, we would make an impression on the mind of the reader strong and lasting, that to recognise the effect of a remedy after its administration, however slight that effect might be, is an *essential* duty of the homœopathic practitioner. It requires, we know, a most critical examination; and daily and hourly practice will make it more and more easy. It puzzles us how a practitioner knows when to cease repeating the dose of the remedy, if he overlooks the re-action caused by it; if this re-action is denied—for there are those who do deny it—then it follows that drugs cause no effects whatever. We will not, however, argue the point at this time, but assume what is, we think, proved—that drugs, attenuated drugs, even to the 30th, 50th, 100th, and higher, do cause a disturbance of the vital power, each developing characteristic symptoms, which can and should be recognised by the practitioner. These effects can be perceived and reduced to a certainty only by a most careful and thorough comparison of the pathogenesis of the drug employed, and the symptoms of the disease, as the latter existed previously to the administration of the remedy, and afterwards. If this examination is conducted as it should be, it may be noticed, that in some cases, all or nearly so, of the disease's symptoms will be aggravated in a greater or less degree. In other cases a few of them only will become more violent; and if the remedy has been taken in too large a dose or too often repeated at short intervals, then some of the characteristic symptoms of the drug may be developed; and this takes place, too, even when the remedy is highly attenuated, and not unfrequently from a single dose. The vast importance of

this knowledge, in every case of disease, to the homœopathic practitioner, can be estimated only by those who habitually and perseveringly engage in such critical examinations of their cases.

It is a habit of some to ascribe, without investigation or thought, an exaltation of the symptoms to the natural course of the disease, which in some cases is true, but not by any means in all; and because of these facts, how important it is to be able to discriminate in the way we have stated. To show the value, the practical value; in fact, to show how indispensable is the knowledge to which reference is here made, we mention an established fact, which is this: that when the vital force responds to the impression of a remedy, by what is termed a re-action, if the dose be repeated, its curative effect which has begun to be developed, will be disturbed, and so much so in some cases, both in acute and chronic diseases, especially in the latter, as to be defeated; and the drug which was acting as the remedy cannot again be employed in the case, even while the symptoms seem to indicate it. In connection we will mention another fact; that this is the reason why practitioners go on administering from day to day, and several times in each day, the same drug which the symptoms more and more clearly indicate almost after every dose, and yet a cure does not follow; and it may be, we remark further, that it is under such conditions that practitioners spring to the conclusion that although the remedy is distinctly perceived by them in accordance with the therapeutic law, yet both the law and the drug are at fault on account of some unknown peculiarity in the case. And therefore they resort to really unknown allopathic measures. The mismanagement of remedies will defeat cures; and unless practitioners of our school direct their attention to the subject of this brief article, they may rely on it, their success in the cure of human maladies will not be such as the science of Homœopathy fairly warrants anticipation.

It is not unusual for a few prominent allopathists of this city to say to their patients who are inclined to favor Homœopathy, that they treat them according to that system. The New-York Academy of Medicine should investigate this subject. If it wants names and proof, apply to the editor of this Journal.

ACCOUCHEMENT OF MARIE ANTOINETTE.

Marie Thérèse Charlotte, *fille du roi*, or, as she was afterwards called, Madame Royale, was born at Versailles on the 19th December, 1789, and her entrance into a world, which was to be to her a scene of sorrow and mourning, had nearly cost the life of her mother. The severe sufferings of the queen, which necessitated extreme measures, were augmented by the barbarous custom then prevalent at the court of France, of admitting the public to witness the birth of an heir to the crown. Madame Campan has given a graphic account of the scene that passed in the chamber of Marie Antoinette at the moment of her accouchement, and the fearful risk to which she was exposed by such an abuse of the privilege of the people. The royal family, the princes of the blood, and the ministers of the crown had passed the preceding night in the rooms adjoining the queen's bedchamber, in hourly expectation of the event; but, at the approach of the critical moment—a moment when in all cases the greatest precaution, the utmost tranquillity, are necessary to ensure the safety of the sufferer—the public were admitted, who burst tumultuously into the room, and filling it to suffocation, not only impeded the movements of those whose assistance was required on the august patient, but heated the atmosphere to a degree that produced the most alarming results. Had not the king's forethought caused the tapestry screens which surrounded the queen's bed to be secured by strong cords, they would inevitably have been thrown down upon her by the rush of people, some of whom mounted upon the consoles and cabinets in order to obtain a more commodious view of the royal sufferer. The noise made by them—the stifling heat they occasioned—perhaps, too, the disappointment experienced by the queen on finding that her child was not a son, produced one of those nervous shocks which are so often fatal to women in her situation. Her face became convulsed, the blood rushed to her head, and complete insensibility followed. For a moment it was feared that she had ceased to live, and consternation reigned around. The Princess de Lamballe fainted, and was borne lifeless through the crowd. The king, with a strength which had acquired additional force from desperation, burst open the lofty windows, which had been closed and secured by bands of paper pasted around them, and admitted a current of fresh air into the room. The gentleman-ushers summarily expelled the inquisitive and indiscreet crowd. The queen was bled in the foot, and as the blood gushed forth, she unclosed her eyes and slowly returned to life. Then a delirium of joy succeeded to the terror of the preceding moment. Tears of thankfulness were shed by all

around, and the bedchamber-woman who announced to the noblemen assembled in the *cabinet des nobles* that the queen had recovered consciousness, and had spoken, was publicly embraced by the Austrian ambassador and the Prince de Paix, and literally inundated with their tears.—*Memoirs of the Duchess of Angoulême, the last of the Dauphines.*

HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

From a notice of the Secretary in another column, it will be seen that the above named society will hold its Annual Meeting on the 8th of next month in the city of Albany. We believe there are from three to four hundred physicians of the Homœopathic school in the State of New York; and we hope to see at least one half of this number at the above meeting.

It should be borne in mind that the *Committee* appointed at the meeting in Syracuse on the subject of a Homœopathic College in this state, will report on the important matter referred to them, which will require the consideration of the society. We assume without any positive knowledge on the subject, that the Committee will favor the establishment of a college in this state, by our school. If the State Society should agree with them, if they report in favor of a college, then it is, we were about to write, absolutely necessary, that every homœopathic physician in the state should zealously cooperate in the measure. This should not be a sectional work. The whole school should feel its interest involved in it, as well as the propagation of a true system of healing.

CASES SHOULD BE RECORDED.

Every physician should feel bound to contribute something for the improvement of the healing art. To this end, a carefully drawn up record of at least one case daily; following it with brief statements from time to time as the treatment goes on, and then the final result. This plan would be of utility to the practitioner himself, as well as a means of collecting valuable facts, which, if laid before the profession through

the medium of our numerous periodicals, would aid in the progress of the art. There is too much reliance on those who rank as the leaders of the profession; because they are not always safe guides. Conventions, Academies, and Societies have not accomplished much in the progress of medicine. Generally, a few minds perform all the mental labor of such associations, while the main body contribute little other than their presence at the meetings, except when elections for officers take place.

We have several times expressed our want of confidence in published cases, we should have qualified the remark by excepting those cases which are transcribed from the original record. We still assert that we suspect the accuracy, unintentional of course, of cases reported from memory, in some instances weeks, months and even years intervening from the time the cases happened and the reports.

THE HOMŒOPATHIC TIMES.

Some of our readers seeing how often we select from the Homœopathic Times, have written to us to know where it is published and what we think of it? We cheerfully answer these questions. The Times is published weekly by Henry Renshaw, 356 Strand, London. We do not know who edits it, for he is so modest that he conceals his name. In form, size, type and paper it is like our own, and of course in our eye it looks well. It is one of the best conducted periodicals of the Homœopathic school. Its doctrines are of the right stamp, clearly stated, and ably defended. And although it would require us to work harder for matter for our own Journal, yet we will submit to this, if some one thousand Homœopathic physicians in this country would subscribe for the Homœopathic Times. Remember, it is published once in each week, and can be mailed in London to any address in America, at a cost of six dollars and fifty cents a year, in advance, except the ordinary newspaper postage in this country.

We make this statement voluntarily; for as we publish our own Journal for the propagation of what we believe a true system

of medicine, we scorn the very thought of jealousy, towards a colleague who advocates the same doctrine with becoming zeal, ability and skill. We take leave to direct the attention of our readers to the advertisement of H. Bailliere, 290 Broadway, New York city, who receives subscriptions for the work under notice.

THE MEDICAL GAZETTE HELPING TO PROPAGATE HOMŒOPATHY.

We are almost disposed to say to the editor of the Medical Gazette of this city, here is our  because of the influence he is exerting in favor of Homœopathy. It is well known that opposite causes will produce the same or similar effects. So it is in the instance to which we refer. The Gazette published what it says, are the inconsistencies of Homœopathy, in distinct propositions; in which the editor shows to every *tyro* in that system, that he is utterly ignorant of the subject about which he writes. The Gazette forgets, that he who sincerely desires a knowledge of Homœopathy, would seek for it in the standard works of that school, and not from an openly avowed, reckless and violent enemy. We will pass by some pretty conclusive evidence furnished by the editor himself, that he is a little behind the age in his knowledge of the doctrines of his own school; but we will not meddle with that, but leave it to his own colleagues, who will do him justice.

ALLOPATHIC HOSPITALS IN SPAIN.

The Governor of Madrid has just issued a memorandum of the facts on which he proposes to institute a reform of the hospitals of that capital, in which he draws the following picture of their present condition. He declares that the provisions served out to the patients are of the worst possible description, and dearer than the best, because nobody endeavoured to force the contractors to fulfil their obligations. The scales for the weighing out of the provisions were not equal, so that scandalous facilities were given to fraud. The daily consumption of sheep amounted to forty, the best of which went to the tables of the hospital clerks, and the worst to the patients. Eight hundred pounds of chocolate were consumed every month, not by the patients, because chocolate is not an article of hospital diet, except in rare cases,

but by the *employés*. The kitchens were filthy in the extreme; the number of cooks and kitchen people so great that they hindered each other from working. The mattresses of the patients were half emptied of their wool, the property of the patients; their clothes were taken away without an inventory being made, the bedding, unclean, the wards unwashed. There was neither respect nor consideration for suffering humanity, the hygiene of the wards being left to the will and pleasure of hospital clerks and ward lackeys. The dwellings of the insane were horrible to see. The medical case-books slovenly kept, with great intervals between the lines; so that agreeable or alimentitious articles were interpolated in great quantities, but never used by the unhappy patients. The bodies were carried naked to the dead-house in the same cart, without distinction of sex or age, many hours before the term marked down by the law, or dictated by prudence. The hair and the teeth of the dead were converted into objects of commerce. The dispensary full of bad drugs, and, notwithstanding the heap of *employés*, dirty in the extreme. The young students employed as dressers were not under any kind of discipline; were never more than an hour at the utmost in the discharge of their duties; and when required by his Excellency the Governor to perform them, imposed impertinent conditions, and when these were not acceded to resigned their offices, and left the patients without assistance; for which act the Governor put them all into prison, and then deprived them of the permission to enter any public establishment. The clergy belonging to the hospital were by far too numerous, and yet their duties were inadequately fulfilled. The Governor of Madrid has turned out all the inferior servants: he has put the economical part of the establishment into the hands of the Sisterhood of Charity, which contains many women of great merit and abnegation, and he has effected great savings of every kind.—*English Churchman*.

HOMŒOPATHY *viâ* YOUNG PHYSIC.

BR J. RUTHERFURD RUSSELL, M.D.

There is a point in the development of a complex science, such as medicine, at which it seems to be overburdened by the multitude of its facts and the insufficiency of its generalisations. When it has reached this stage, and come to a dead lock, it gets no aid from those who have the reputation of being its most successful cultivators. For the very endowments which gave them renown at the time when the science required merely the accumulation of materials, or the critical selection of facts and their lucid

arrangement, disqualifies them from the higher task of grasping the subject as a whole, and viewing it by the light of general philosophy, discovering the true center from which it must be re-organised. This great achievement requires more than the highest powers of analytical acumen; it requires the intuition of synthetic genius. And when the voice of the great discoverer, who is destined to renovate his department of knowledge, makes known the central truth, there is none on whose ear it falls more repulsively than on that of the high priest of the special science itself. Great discoveries belong to philosophy rather than to science; and no class of minds is less prepared to receive them than are those who have devoted themselves to the study of scientific details alone.

There is nothing more, strange or more lamentable than the total absence of philosophical discernment displayed by those who are now the appointed guardians of medicine. While deploring its present uncertain and unscientific character, they do not seem at all aware of the real cause of its poverty, and propose remedies which would be as useless if got as they are impossible to get. Their inability to perceive what medicine stands in need of, arises from the same cause as their rejection of Homœopathy. If there be anything more striking in Dr. Forbes' memorable article than this, that throughout the whole of it he speaks of theory in medicine as if it were quite an unimportant thing, and as if the whole end of the labors of the medical philosopher were attained if he made himself sure of a sufficient number of facts, it is the constant recurrence of the expression, "philosophic practitioner"—whose philosophy seems to consist in doubting much and in doing nothing. Unsparringly as he condemns Homœopathy, as tending to degrade physic by making its practitioners artisans, the position he would appoint to medicine is singularly opposed to the usual requirements of an art and a science. Science is certain knowledge, giving the power of prediction; art is the application of that knowledge. But his science consists in knowing that we can know nothing, and the art he recommends us to practice is the *dolce far niente*! He speaks of Homœopathy as "an ingenious system of medical doctrine, tolerably complete in its organisation, tolerably comprehensive in its views," and says that "it is as good and rational a theory as most of our medical theories. With the great leader of philosophic practitioners, it seems a very light matter whether a theory be right or wrong. He seems to regard it very much in the light of the shell of an oyster, useful only for containing a nutritious body of facts. It is not surprising that, considering theory to be so very insignificant a matter, he lightly observes,

with an inconsistency which might be culpable in one who took a more serious view of the value of theory, "that we may indeed have sufficient proof to satisfy any reasonable mind that the theory, or doctrines, or principles of Homœopathy are false, although he does not enter into any such proof, but waives it till a more convenient season. He turns away contemptuously from the consideration of the theory, doctrines, or principles, and eagerly asks what the *facts* are worth.

The facts arrest and startle him. He finds that under the guidance of this theory practitioners of medicine restore to health more patients than under the orthodox method, which disdains, as an infringement upon the liberty of the faculty, to acknowledge obedience to any theory whatsoever. This fact of the greater success of Homœopathic treatment, is a hook in the nose of Allopathy, which must in some way or other be extracted. The problem is this: By the most authentic returns, more cures are effected in certain dangerous diseases under Homœopathy than under Allopathy; how, then, is the inference to be prevented that, therefore, Homœopathy is good, and the position to be established that it is radically bad? This is done in the simplest and most ingenious way. Good and bad are relative terms: it is the same thing to say that a man is better than a monkey, as to say that a monkey is worse than a man. It merely requires the transposition of the predicates. If we say Homœopathy is better than Allopathy, we suppose some good in the former—more good, at least, than in Allopathy. But we have only to say Allopathy is worse than Homœopathy to get rid of the dilemma. And this is the position our great antagonist assumes! But it is urged, if Homœopathy be bad, and Allopathy still worse, how do you retain your allegiance to Allopathy? To this he answers: it is bad *in esse*, but good *in posse*: it contains the germs of its entire renovation, and it only requires proper attention to foster the latent rudiments of good into vigorous growth. How comes it, a sceptic might inquire, that you, who have so long held a chief place in the cabinet of medicine—you, her appointed, acknowledged, respected minister—should, till now, never have whispered your belief that the system you have been directing requires a thorough reformation! How is it that this momentous truth has been forced from you by the doings of so insignificant a body as the Homœopaths? Surely in the history of our art, among the triumphs of Homœopathy will be recorded,—it forced Dr. Forbes to give his candid opinion of the state of medicine. It forced him to make confessions during his life, which otherwise he might have reserved for his testament."

But let us follow out the process of Young Physic, and see exactly what it is, and to what it leads: Allopathy and Homœopathy are both bad. In their hospitals many patients die, although more recover. The average mortality in both is much alike; the kind of diseases which kill them is much alike. It is plain that, as there is no great difference in the amount of recoveries under the two systems, they must both derive their efficacy from the same cause. Now, as the methods of treatment are wholly opposite, the benefit must accrue from something beyond or outside of the treatment altogether. The only thing beyond that, common to both, is the natural power of recovery. Here, then, is the real explanation of the cause of the equality in the mortality and recovery in the two sets of hospitals: that those who are able to stand the treatment and the disease get well; and those who are unable die. The practice of medicine (*medendi*, curing) turns out to be nothing. All that the physician can do, is to open his wards and see fair play between nature and death. If the struggle between them end in favor of the latter, he has the satisfaction of confirming his diagnosis; if in favor of the former, of dismissing his patient.

Is it, then, really come to this—that after two thousand years of observing disease, we are no further advanced in its treatment? In what respect is Young Physic superior to Hippocrates? They both advise the same thing: Watch, say they, the progress of disease, but do not interfere. Young Physic, however, remarks, that all who have deviated from this rule have done mischief. All that his greater experience has taught him is, to have greater confidence in the canon of Hippocrates. How long is this new cycle to run? Are we to stand, like sentinel-stars, for other two thousand years, silently watching the course of disease, while ever and anon an eccentric man of action suggests some practical innovation, till, at the expiry of this double millenium, another Forbes arises, and with his critical crow-bar demolishes the systems of these practical men, and dooms his fellow-mortals to endure all the pangs of sickness, with nothing but the consolations of philosophy to alleviate them! In short, what is the germ in Allopathy on which Dr. Forbes rests his hopes? The only positive recommendations we can find are—carefully to watch the progress of disease, to employ all proper hygienic measures, and to *use the numerical method in noting down the effects which have been or may be observed to follow the administration of the medicines*. The first two recommendations, however excellent, can hardly be considered as at all differing from those given by Hippocrates; and as Dr. Forbes

evidently expects much good to accrue from the last, it is to it we shall now direct our sole attention: and if we can establish that the only results of such a method are increasing perplexity, rank error, or total disbelief in the powers of medicine, we must acknowledge the incapacity of Young Physic to be of any use—except in the way of a pioneer.

“*Ars longa, vita brevis, observatio fallax;*” how, then, can any man, in the short term of his life, discover for himself what remedies are certainly useful in the all but infinite variety of diseases he has to treat? Suppose even that he has the advantage of a large hospital, is it possible for him to make experiments in such a way as to arrive at certain knowledge? The Young Physic School, which prides itself upon its philosophy, recommends the use of the numerical method, that, by noting down the result of each medicine in each form of disease, we may at length arrive at positive data to direct us in future cases. Let us inquire what philosophers of established reputation think of this plan.

M. Comte scouts with the same severity as Dr. Forbes all ontological speculations, and founds his system on the ascertainment of positive phenomena alone, leaving the mystics to pry into the cause of these phenomena. He has, moreover, a profound respect for mathematical science, places it as the first and fundamental science in his scheme of human knowledge, and is most anxious to carry the numerical spirit as far into general science as it will legitimately go. He would apply the method of numerical notation to every department of human knowledge where it could be of any avail. Surely, if any philosopher of note is likely to countenance Young Physic's brave attempt to reform medicine by introducing into it the accuracy of arithmetic, it must be M. Auguste Comte. His opinion is given in the following words:—

“Indeed, the spirit of calculation tends in our day to introduce itself into this study (*Physiology*), especially into that part of it relating to medical questions, by a much less direct method, under a much more specious form, and with infinitely more modest pretensions. I wish to speak of that pretended application of it which is called the statistics of medicine, from which many savans [*e. g.*, *Young Physic*] expect wonders, and which, from its very nature, can lead only to profound and direct degradation of the medical art (reduced by it to a blind enumeration). Such a method, if we may be allowed to call it by the name of method at all, cannot in reality, be anything else than absolute empiricism, disguised under the frivolous garb of mathematics. Pushed to its extreme logical consequences, it will tend to make all rational

medication radically disappear from medicine, by conducting the practitioner to make chance trials of certain therapeutic measures, for the purpose of noting down with minute precision the numerical results of their application. It is evident, on principle, that the continual variations to which all organism is subjected, are necessarily even more pronounced in a pathological, than in a normal state, as a result of which the cases must be even less exactly similar, whence results the manifest impossibility of making a judicious comparison between two curative methods derived from data furnished by statistical tables alone, independent of some sound medical theory. No doubt some direct experimentation, restrained under proper limits, might be of great importance to medicine as well as to physiology, but it is precisely under the strict condition that it shall never be simply empirical, but that it shall always attach itself either in its institution or in its interpretation to an entire system of corresponding positive doctrines. (*A l'ensemble systématique des doctrines positives correspondantes*). Notwithstanding the imposing aspect of the forms of exactness, it would be difficult to conceive of an opinion in therapeutics more superficial and more uncertain than that which rests solely on the easy computation of fatal and favorable cases, to say nothing of the pernicious practical consequences of such a manner of proceeding, where one could not beforehand exclude any kind of attempt.

“It is really deplorable that geometricians have sometimes honored with some kind of encouragement such a profoundly irrational aberration, by making vain and puerile efforts to determine, by their illusory theory of chances, the number of cases sufficient to make these statistical results legitimate.”—*Cours de Philosophie positive*, par M. Auguste Comte. Tome 3^{me} pp. 418, 420.

We must again remind Young Physic that M. Comte is one of the first of living mathematicians, and one who, more than any other philosopher, insists upon the prolongation of the mathematical method as far forward into the more special and complex sciences as it can be made to go.

(To be continued.)

Some of our zealous and kind-hearted colleagues virtually tell us, that they know much better than we do, how to carry on the work of reform in medicine; this may be so, but the difficulty is to convince us of that fact.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth.

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY, 1853.

NO. 10.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

VIEW OF PROFESSIONAL LIBERALITY AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

By S. HAHNEMANN

I do not here refer to that low, envious, trading spirit, for which the pressure of want is often the cause that can best be pleaded in excuse; I wish to say a few words about the professional jealousy of medical men among themselves, which is the prevalent custom in Germany (in the southern, more than the northern parts), a *bellum omnium contra omnes*, which has had a most injurious influence on the prosperity of one of the noblest arts, and the one which stands most in need of improvement—medicine. For no sooner has a colleague made a suggestion that must be for the general good, put forward a perhaps useful proposition, discovered something profitable, than instantly the professional jealousy of his colleagues (with very few exceptions) falls foul of him in order to bury in oblivion, or if possible, to destroy the novelty by spoken or written depreciations, insinuations, sophistries, or even injurious aspersions, and all because—it did not originate with themselves. Instead of seeing, as we do in England and Scotland, fraternal meetings, and societies of physicians and surgeons, animated by the desire to promote the welfare of humanity, and investigating medical subjects for the purpose of mutual improvement and perfection, without party-spirit, without seeking self-aggrandisement, without ministering to individual vanity—we see the German medical men (with few exceptions) completely divided among themselves, each acting by himself, *pro modulo ingenii*, occasionally appropriating the useful discoveries of others, but quite silently, without betraying by the slightest sign that any one else has anything to recommend him, or that they were indebted for anything whatsoever to this one or the other. Not only do they make use of the propositions and inventions of others without betraying the least thankfulness, but they often throw out spiteful insinuations against the originator, at all events always (few are the exceptions!) *without taking any public*

part in promoting and perfecting the proposition or discovery, particularly if it proceed from a German physician; far more likely are they to do so if it belong to a foreign physician. How much this egotistical professional jealousy prevents the shooting forth and vigorous growth of our divine healing art, which is still in the condition of an undeveloped bud, must be evident to every non-professional person. Were it not for this paltry self-seeking spirit, of a truth Germany alone, with its great intellectual talents, could affect a regeneration of the great art.

How spitefully Wichmann was assailed when he exposed the prevalent fallacies respecting difficult teething! How infamously the same clique calumniated that unenvious favorite of the Aselepiadean muse—Hufeland, whose soul is animated by truth alone! How was Tode, how was Sömmering treated! Were the men that could act in this manner exclusively devoted to the beneficent art whose aim is the weal of humanity?

Ever sadder, ever more gloomy are the prospects of the development of our art in the new century; without friendliness and good-fellowship among its professors, it will remain but a bungling art for another century.

Let it not be retorted that there now exists, at least among the followers of the Brunonian system, an *esprit de corps*. The rallying motto of a sectarian name is incapable of exciting to sober, calm scientific investigation; it only rouses the explosive spirit of accusations of heresy to a fierce volcanic flame. Truth and the weal of humanity should be the only motto of the genuine elucidators of the art and the watch-word of their brotherly, peaceful bond of union, without slavish adherence to any sectarian leader, if we would not see the little good that we know completely sacrificed to party-spirit and discord. In these times, when accusations of heresy are so rife, the most important question that is ever put is, "Art thou of Paul, art thou of Cephas or Apollos?" Would it not be far better to say, "Brother! what is the peculiar mode of action of cinchona bark on the

healthy individual? so that we may at length learn how to employ it with confidence in diseases, seeing that we have hitherto blindly wasted many thousand hundredweights of it, at one time doing good, at another harm, without knowing what it was we did." Would it not be better to say, "Dear colleague! let us together investigate and observe the many and various kinds of intermittent fevers, and let us unite in laying before the world the discoveries we thus make, as to which kind among them may be, *cæteris paribus*, *always cured* by cinchona, which by sal ammoniac, which by chamomile, which by ignatia, which by capsicum, &c."—"God forbid! who would consent to such an exposure of himself as to confess to his colleagues or to the public that he did not know everything? Those around me must be impressed with the belief that I am infallible, that I embrace the whole sphere of the art, as I hold a ball in my hand, that the inmost secrets of medical science lie clearly open to my all-seeing eye, like the seed-receptacle of an apple cut through the middle. I dare not say one word that could betray that something was still to be discovered or that there was any room for improvement. But the notion that another and more especially a German colleague could teach us something more, or could make any fresh discovery, must not be uttered, must be to the best of our ability scouted."

Such is the spirit that has prevailed in Germany during the latter half until the end of the bygone century; the benefactors of their race, and with them the good spirit that inspired them with zeal for the common weal, were sought to be kept down and set aside. Just as theological polemics have never produced a desire for truth, a perception of the high object of our existence or genuine virtue and devotional feeling—just as the personal squabbles of literary men have never succeeded in developing the love of art, the true æsthetic feeling, enlightened taste, and artistic skill—in like manner it needs no great sagacity to understand that the mutual detractions of medical men can have no other result but the depreciation and obscurity of their art, which is, without that, the most obscure of all arts.

Honorable, non-medical friends, endowed with a desire to promote the well-being of mankind and who have had the advantage of a scientific education!—the energies of my life, which have been devoted to promote the welfare of the community, have also been cramped and kept under by this unpatriotic spirit of many of the medical men of Germany.

As soon as I stepped forth among my colleagues, not without nearly twenty years of preparation, not without many long

years of Pythagorean silence, to contribute here and there something to the improvement of our art, I found that I had lost my accustomed peace and quietness, and had fallen among a crowd of professional brethren, who (with few exceptions) regard nothing impartially; I was maligned. And how easy it is to persecute, to malign an art, which has hitherto been founded on ever-changing maxims, in which by the force of authorities, learned, empty terminology, sophistry, scholastic, stereotyped dogmas, and imaginary experience, black was made to appear white, just as any one pleased, especially where the judgment was perverted by depravity of heart, egotism and illiberality.

It is undoubtedly true that truth penetrates even through the thickest clouds of prejudice, but the often too tedious conflict of the opposing elements conveys a disagreeable, a discouraging impression to the mind. Thus at the commencement of my career, on account of my discovery of the best anti-venereal medicine, the soluble mercury, I was abused in the most vulgar manner in a journal notorious for its outrageous vituperations, and also elsewhere, but the common experience of Europe in a few years removed the slander from this remedy and worthily appreciated a discovery that I had unselfishly revealed for the good of humanity, in order to make amends for the death of thousands who had been literally dissolved by the abuse of the feebly anti-venereal preparations of corrosive mercury. The same thing happened when I was afterwards again (to pass over the bad reception some other useful truths met with) abused in the same vituperative journal on account of my "*new principle*," where I taught a mode of learning to look at diseases from a point of view that directs us *almost unmistakeably* to the appropriate remedy for every case—showing how to discover from the positive nature of medicinal agents the diseases for which they are suitable. But because this kind of system differed so much from the ordinary one, because it was so simple, so unartificial and (purposely) so free from the sacred arabesques of the learned language of the schools, it made very little impression, it was not cultivated by German medical men, but was sought to be quietly shelved by them.

Now, once more, at the end of the century that has just expired, my zeal for the welfare of mankind misled me to announce a prophylactic remedy for one of the most destructive of children's diseases, *scarlet fever*. Scarcely a fourth part of the number I might have expected subscribed for it. This lukewarm interest shown for such an important affair discouraged me, and I arranged that the subscribers should receive a portion of the medicine itself, in order to satisfy them, in case my book on

the subject should not be published. The subscribers consisted chiefly of physicians who had epidemics of scarlet-fever in their neighborhood. At least thirty of these, whom I begged by letter to testify to the truth, and to publish the result (be it what it might) in the *Reichs-Anzeiger*, made no reply.

Two others, unsolicited by me, Dr. Jani in Gera, and Dr. Müller in Plauen, wrote something on the subject, but, good heavens! in what a spirit! Is this the way one colleague treats another in Germany? Is an affair of such importance for mankind to be so readily dismissed?

After the latter had said in No. 215 of *R.-A.*, 1800, "that in the epidemic he witnessed no child took scarlet-fever who had used this medicine for two or three weeks," he repents of his honesty and feels himself compelled in No. 239 "to deny the truth of his former declaration (the facts brought forward by himself!) because one child took the scarlet-fever. This case proves more against the efficacy of the remedy than 500, where the individuals seem to have been protected by it, prove for it."

What monstrous logic! Mercury is, as is well known, the best and sole remedy in the venereal disease; thousands have been cured by its means. "No," quoth Bavius, "I could show you at least twenty cases where it did no good. Mercury is of no use; these twenty cases certainly prove more against the efficacy of the remedy than your thousands of successful cases prove for it. Therefore we should rather let ourselves be eaten up by the venereal disease than have it cured by mercury, because out of many thousand cases there are twenty where it does no good."—"A single case in which cinchona bark failed in intermittent fever proves more for the worthlessness of this bark than 500 cases in which it was efficacious for it." What a delirium of logic! The good Dr. Müller has once upon a time heard of the deduction *a minori ad majus*, and seeks to apply that here. In like manner the wag made the deduction *a minori ad majus* in the Müllerean fashion: "Since it feels hard to lie upon a single feather on the bare floor, this proves more against the softness of feathers than a bed filled with millions of eider-feathers for their softness; I will therefore never more sleep upon feather-beds after having lain so hard upon one feather."

But perhaps Dr. Müller invented this pleasant piece of sophistry only in order to eradicate from the minds of the uninitiated, by one (philanthropic) blow, this German invention, *not proceeding from himself*. Be it so, my friend! But have you anything better to substitute for the remedy? Is there to be found in medical writings a single mode of treating scarlet-fever on which we may rely? We shall not say a

word about a preventive remedy. According to the directions usually given, there is not a single symptom that can be removed without several worse ones being excited. It may be said of the old mode of treatment of every acute disease: "*With our medicines and without our medicines the primary fever goes off in twenty-one days, or the patient dies in the meantime, he might not have died had he not taken our medicines.*"

Dr. Jani, on the other hand, says in No. 255, that his scarlet-fever was complicated with malignant typhus-fever and acute herpetic fever, and very rarely ran a regular course.

He then seeks to prove "that my preservative does not protect unconditionally." He might have spared himself the pains. *God himself cannot create a remedy that shall be unconditionally efficacious, that when used wrongly, at an inappropriate time, in an improper place, or under adverse circumstances, shall yet of necessity do good.*

"After it became universally prevalent, and was raging among them like an evil demon, he allowed ten families, consisting of thirty-six children, to use my remedy. Three children in one family were attacked by scarlet-fever whilst using it (?). Of the thirty children of the remaining nine families who used it for a month, none was attacked by scarlet-fever. *But as far as was known none of them were exposed to infection.*"

Therefore it was no merit of Hahnemann's prophylactic that just those nine families with their thirty children remained free amidst all the others. This miracle is owing solely to the fact that they were not exposed to infection (*scilicet*) at a period when, as he asserts, scarlet-fever was *universally prevalent*. When an epidemic of scarlet-fever (which generally does not spare two out of a hundred children in the place) is *universally prevalent*, does the mere circumstance "of not having been exposed to the infection as far as was known" suffice to preserve from infection? Were that the case, it were impossible that any epidemic of scarlet-fever could ever arise, because no child of sensible or at least of timorous parents would ever be knowingly exposed to infection!

"But because it was not I, but another, and what is worse, a German physician who discovered the remedy, it must be allowed us, in order that the honor may not be given to the preservative, to ascribe the wonderful, unheard-of exemption of the nine families, to a notoriously inefficient cause, in order that we may be enabled to shelve Hahnemann's prophylactic remedy before the very eyes of the all-seeing public."

Here are striking features of the professional liberality among the physicians of our time! Here is a fine specimen of zea-

lous endeavor to clear up the truth, of warm interest in promoting an affair of infinite importance to humanity.

The furtherance of every means, be it ever so small, that can save human life, that can bring health and security, (a God of love invented this blessed and most wondrous of arts!) should be a sacred object to the true physician; chance, or the labor of a physician, has discovered this one. Away, then, with all grovelling passions at the altar of this sublime God-head, whose priests we are!

We all strive after a common, holy object; but it is not easy to be attained. It is only by joining hand in hand, only by a brotherly union of our powers, only by a mutual intercommunication and a common dispassionate development of all our knowledge, views, inventions and observations, that this high aim can be attained:—*the perfecting of the medical art.*

HOW TO DECIDE WHICH MODE OF PRACTICE TO ADOPT.

It is often the case that individuals do not know how to determine which mode of practice to adopt: allopathic or homœopathic. The inquiry is of vast importance, and should be thoroughly investigated; and we shall be happy if any suggestions from us would aid those who are "halting between two opinions" to choose that system of medicine which is supported by the strongest evidence.

The question under consideration should be settled while in health, and not put off until disease has weakened the body and mind, and the matter left to the decision of relatives and neighbors.

In the next place, it is not necessary for the purpose, to have a knowledge of medicine; nor is it best to consult those laymen who pretend to such knowledge; nor is it wise to counsel with physicians on that subject; to this latter there are many objections; we do not mean to insinuate any wrong motive in them, but each one will, of course, advocate his own practice, and in a way not likely to help a layman to a satisfactory decision.

It is by some, thought, that a remarkable cure is the strongest proof that the mode of treatment was the best; especially the last, if the case had had a different one at the first. This is an error.

For unexpected recoveries from dange-

rous diseases happen in all kinds of practice, and such cases prove but little; in truth they are hardly of any account to establish a system of medicine, and both the people and physicians view them in that light.

He who has been in a city practice for twenty-five years will agree with us in that opinion. We have known extraordinary recoveries of health from the lowest diseased conditions, and yet neither the mode of treatment, nor the reputation of the physicians much benefited thereby. The people would have the right view of this subject if they would allow undisturbed their strong common sense to govern them. They know that the truth or falsity of a system of medicine must be ascertained by its general results in all kinds of diseases, and among all classes of people. We would have Homœopathy judged by this rule. This brings us to *statistics*.

The imperfection of *statistical* tables of diseases is thought by some a sufficient cause for their entire rejection, as evidence to aid in a decision of the merits of a system of medicine. Now, let us sift this seemingly formidable objection to the bottom.

Those *statistics* which are at all worthy of notice come from hospitals and dispensaries and other public institutions, where records are kept of the cases treated, and from these records the *statistical* tables are derived. Assuming, as we are bound to do, that there is no intention to deceive, then the only errors that can take place in these table are in the *diagnosis*, or fixing the appropriate name to each disease, and in reporting incomplete for complete cures. Any other inaccuracies are of no importance. These errors are not likely to be numerous, and should not diminish the force of the testimony which these tables are designed to supply.

To reach the object of this article we remark, that whatever pretensions there may be to the contrary, there can be but two modes of medical treatment of diseases; and, however various the measures may be, these modes are properly designated by the terms allopathic and homœopathic. Now, each of these have public institutions for the treatment of the sick, and it is the custom of each to publish from their records, at fixed periods, *statistics* of the number of patients

treated, of what diseases, and the results. The original records are kept in both in a similar manner; the attending physicians and surgeons, generally speaking, are of equal standing in professional education, experience and morality. Consequently, the statistics of each, it is fair to infer, are equally accurate, for whatever errors may exist in one are equally liable to exist in the other; so that, for the purpose of comparison in the weight of evidence, they are alike. Therefore, if *statistics* show in one mode of practice an average loss of fourteen in a hundred, and the other an average loss of but five in a hundred, then we have reliable proof; in fact, as far as the nature of the subject admits it, it is proved that one is safer than the other. We do not pretend to give the actual per centage of loss in either case, but it is about the ratio between Allopathy and Homœopathy. The former is, invariably, much the largest in all our public institutions, and, so far as it is possible to ascertain from private practice, the proportion of deaths by allopathic practice is greater than by homœopathic. To decide, therefore, which system of medicine should be adopted, it is only necessary to seek for information of the general results, and not allow a single case, or a few cases to decide the question.

(From the *Homœopathic Times*.)

HOMŒOPATHIC TREATMENT OF THE YELLOW FEVER.

[A highly esteemed colleague and contributor thus writes:—]

I have not yet prepared an article for you on the treatment of this pest, but I have some interesting matter to communicate. "Ethiopia stretches forth her hands;" the islands and colonies of the West Indies are ripe for Homœopathy.

One of my dearest friends—faithful and true—a clergyman, thus writes to me, on the 10th of last month, from Barbadoes:—

"The yellow fever has been very severe, and is still prevailing, not only in the garrison and town, but in many parts of the country, even in some most healthy localities. In all these cases, however, we could trace its importation from the town or the suburbs; in one of which, 'Blackrock,' a whole family has been almost swept off. Some negroes have died, which is a remarkable fact; in general, they escape during visitations of yellow fever. Dr. GODING, who has embraced Homœopathy, has treated the poor successfully with *our* remedies. A feeler was put forth in one of the newspapers to draw him out. He published at first anonymously, and then *detailed* a case in full, and put his name. This has made a

stir. I have begged Mr. — to send you by this mail all the newspapers that contain anything in reference to the question, which I hope he will do. You will thus have a full view of the matter. I have been practising with some success. I had, however, so many applications, many of whom had nothing the matter, but came for medicine, because it was given, and as they had abundance of leisure—I am astonished at the idleness of the people. I cannot tell how they live—they crowded in upon me. One day forty-five were here; some ill. I had some interesting cases, which I was sorry to lose sight of; but I had a hint, that if any one to whom I gave medicine died, the coroner might hold an inquest. No doubt, there was a little jealousy at the bottom, but I am glad to have a breathing-time. I must ascertain from the Attorney-General (who favors Homœopathy) whether I can be indicted, etc., before I resume. Many of the people who came had disordered their stomachs by smoking and rum. The effects of homœopathic treatment upon the children were most marked, and some adults, who would be orderly, have been benefited. The battle has fairly begun; of the final result I have no doubt. I was sorry to see the discussion at the Congress at Edinburgh touching the "*auxiliaries*." I find Dr. Prince protesting, and the *Homœopathic Times* sharp in its remarks. . . . I have treated a case of fever in a black boy. *Acon.* abated the fever and increased the secretion of urine and reduced the high color. The father and mother were astonished at the result corresponding so closely with what I told them I hoped it would be. Many persons about me—the clerk, sexton, &c.—are thorough converts, and many of the negroes also."

We now give a leading article from the *West Indian*, a Barbadoes paper:—

"We feel satisfied that we need not apologize for the space we have devoted, in this and previous numbers, to inquiries concerning the nature of the destructive fever which has carried off so many persons, and of the treatment of patients suffering from it. It has baffled the skill and experience of our most eminent medical men; and a new method having been tried with it, with apparently better effect, we have thought it our duty to open our columns to anything that promises or professes to alleviate or remove the dreadful sacrifice of life which it has occasioned, during the last three months that it has prevailed. We give insertion to-day to a letter from Dr. SINCKLER, to which we invite the attention of our readers, with his treatment of two cases, as we have before published the method of treatment of Dr. GODING, in St. Peter's, upon the same principles. This treatment appears to us the safest and the best, because it does not reduce the strength of the patient by bleeding, leeching, or excessive doses of mercury, or vomiting—the methods adopted by the practitioners of the old system. For the fever appears to be of a nature, of itself, to take away strength, and to feed upon the vital powers as long as it lasts; and when it passes off, it leaves the patient so weak that it requires a strong constitution and the greatest care to prevent him from sinking from mere exhaustion. Believing, then, that we are doing service to the public, by spreading information concerning the safest means of parrying and overcoming the attack of this direful infection, which, though happily not a constant, is an occasional visitor of our shores, but seldom in so destructive a form as it has appeared on this occasion, we make no apology for calling attention to a subject, which perhaps will appear to many unsuited to our columns, and which requires to be treated in a fuller and calmer manner than can be expected in a newspaper controversy. We have received other communications from the supporters of the old system, which shall appear according as we have room for them."

Here is now a case treated by Dr. GODING:—

(From the *West Indian*, October 28th.)

"We have received through our correspondent M., to whom we are much obliged, the homœopathic

treatment of a case of yellow fever in detail, by Dr. Goding, whose name and well-known character are the best guarantee that could be given of the facts. The letter published in our paper of the 22nd instant, on the homœopathic treatment of the fever generally, was also from him. On the representation of his friends that it was desirable that his name should be attached to a communication of such importance, in order to give the public confidence in the correctness of the statements, he has done so; not to challenge a controversy with the supporters of the old system of treatment, but merely, as we have said above, to authenticate the facts adduced by him in his communication; and how desirable this is, will appear from the comments of a correspondent in our present number on the statements of the doctor, published in our paper before the last:—

"J. L. K—, white, aged 14, of bilious temperament, was suddenly seized, at four o'clock a. m., on the 15th, with chills, quickly followed by headache and hot fever. Found him at ten a. m., with the following symptoms:—Severe and shooting pains in head; forehead very hot; cheeks much flushed; eyes injected, and intolerant of light; tongue slightly furred in centre, with red edges; dry burning heat of skin; uneasy, anxious expression of countenance; pulse quick, full, and bounding; oppressed respiration. He complains of pains 'all over him,' but particularly in his head, back, and lower extremities.

"*Tinct. Aconite*, 3rd dilution, five drops in a wineglassful of water.

"*Tinct. Belladonna* 3, in a wineglassful of water; a teaspoonful of the medicines to be given alternately every hour. A slip of muslin was laid on his burning forehead, and ordered to be moistened with cold water. Water alone was to be given to the patient to assuage his thirst.

"Two o'clock p. m. No material change; the medicines to be continued every two hours, in alternation.

"October 16th, six o'clock, a. m. Has passed a very restless and sleepless night; was delirious at times; bowels moved in the night; the tongue is now furred, of a dark grey in the centre, with very red edges and tip; the eyes still injected, with a very slight tinge of yellow; fetor of breath; complains of cutting sore pains across his stomach and bowels; the abdomen sensitive to pressure; thirst; the skin is still very hot; pulse quick, but more compressible than yesterday; the headache relieved.

"Discontinue *Belladonna*, and give it occasionally only; should the head get worse, *Aconite* every third hour. Eight o'clock p. m.—Much the same; head cooler, and a slight moisture on the skin. Continue *Aconite* every fourth hour.

"October 17th, ten o'clock a. m. No sleep, and a restless night; garrulous delirium; 'talked idly,' had several large, loose, and dark evacuations; urine red and turbid; vomited twice, at eight and nine o'clock, dark greenish matter, with black streaks adhering to the sides and bottom of the basin; the heat of the skin has abated, and gives place to a clammy moisture; pulse quick and quite compressible; great languor; cannot move without assistance; turning in bed causes nausea; anxious and very pale face, indicative of mental uneasiness and weakness; complains of great debility, and a burning sore pain in pit of the stomach, and in the bowels; answers at times incoherently to questions; fetid breath.

"*Tinct. Arsenicum alb.*, 3rd dilution, four drops in a wineglass of water, a teaspoonful every two hours. Discontinue *Aconite*.

"Two o'clock p. m. Burning in stomach relieved, but there is still pain and nausea; fetor of breath; the patient has a more cheerful countenance, and says he is better.

"Continue *Arsenicum* every fourth hour.

"Eight o'clock, p. m. At about three o'clock the patient suddenly gulped up a tablespoonful of black matter like coffee-grounds; since then he has had no vomiting. He now seems better; the tongue is cleaning, and the pulse improves; the skin almost natural; still complains of pain and lump in his stomach, and the burning has returned slightly.

"*Nux vomica* 6, three globules directly. Continue *Arsenicum* every six hours; *Veratrum alb.* 3, three drops in a wineglass of water; a teaspoonful to be

given, should the black vomit return during the night.

"October 18th, six a. m. Had a vomit at three o'clock this morning, but merely of whitish glairy mucus, very slightly tinged with dark streaks.

"A dose of the *Veratrum* was given.

"The patient feels much better, although he has not slept, and all his symptoms are more favorable; he says his teeth are loose; and on examination of the mouth, the gums are found dark red, tender, and slightly ulcerated at the joinings with the teeth;* the tongue continues unnaturally red, with a thin white furred centre. The burning and lump in the stomach remain, but without nausea.

"Discontinue *Arsenicum*. *Nux vomica* 6, three globules directly.

"As the patient has taken nothing since his illness but water, sago was ordered, in small quantities at a time.

October 19th. Improvement progressive; skin natural; fetor of breath gone; bad appetite; expresses desire for a little bread and honey, which was allowed, and beef-tea ordered; as he sleeps badly, *China* 3, three globules to be given to-night.

"20th. Slept soundly through the night, and is much refreshed.

"21st and 22nd. *In statu quo*; no more medicine; has been moved on a sofa, and feels stronger; urinary difficulties, the secretion being of a deep tinge like that in jaundice.

"*Bry.* 6, three globules.

"Has permission to go home into the country to-morrow.

"24th. Visited my patient to-day; he bore his journey well, and although weak, he progresses favorably.

"FRANCIS GODING, M. D.

"Whitehall, St. Peter's."

Subsequently the Editor remarks:—

"The fever has moderated in its violence we are happy to say, although it still continues to attack persons both in the town and country. More persons are seized by it, but the number of those who fall victims to it is fewer. The weather still continues dry, with an intolerably fierce sun, fast destroying the hopes of a large crop for next year. The wind still blows from the south, and has driven all the clouds to the north part of the island, where, from appearances and some growl of thunder, we doubt not that that there has been a fall of rain this forenoon."

The good people of England need not alarm themselves about yellow fever being acclimated in England. It is a disease of warm countries, not of such as are facetiously called *temperate*, like that of England. But we give the latest intelligence:—

"FEARFUL RAVAGES OF THE YELLOW FEVER.

"The royal West India mail-packet *Medway*, Capt. Weller, from the West Indies, arrived at Southampton on Thursday, and landed her mails under the charge of Lieut. P. Rainier, R. N., Admiralty agent. The following are her dates of sailing:—Vera Cruz, Nov. 5; Tampico, no mails; Havana, Nov. 12; Chagres, Nov. 8; Honduras, Nov. 8; Carthage, Nov. 10; Jamaica, Nov. 10; Demerara, Nov. 9; Trinidad, Nov. 9; Barbadoes, Nov. 11; Antigua, Nov. 13; Martinique, Nov. 12; Grenada, Nov. 10; Porto Rico, Nov. 14; St. Thomas, Nov. 20; La Guayra, Nov. 10.

"On the arrival of the *Medway* in Southampton Water, at half-past nine o'clock, a surgeon went off with the custom-house officers to inquire into the bill of health she brought. It was found that five had died; on board the *Medway* from yellow fever, since she had left Jamaica; that two had died since she left St. Thomas, one of them on the 29th ult. The *Medway* was then ordered to go some way down the river, and await the orders of the Collector of Customs. Shortly afterwards an order was issued to

* Stomacæ. In the boy who died of the fever, this inflammation of the mouth had something the character of a scurvy.

land the mails, and the Isle of Wight steamer was dispatched to bring them ashore. Dr. Sutherland, of the Board of Health, who is on an official visit to Southampton, and Dr. Cooper, the medical officer of the Board of Health at Southampton, went down to the Medway in the Isle of Wight steamer, to see the surgeon of the Medway, Mr. Scott. The latter stated that the yellow fever broke out on board the Medway in Kingston harbor; that four cases had occurred there, five at St. Thomas, and one after leaving St. Thomas. The five cases of death took place on the 5th, 8th, 14th, 24th, and 29th of last month. There were several cases of death on board besides, but not from yellow fever. There had been seventeen cases of illness in the whole on board the Medway, nine of which had proved fatal. A man who had recovered from an attack of the yellow fever was brought forward to be seen by Dr. Sutherland. He was a common sailor. He looked yellow about the eyes, but strong and cheerful. No one on board the Isle of Wight and Medway steamers were allowed to touch each other, and Dr. Sutherland and Dr. Cooper stood on the paddle-box of the former, and Dr. Scott stood on the sponson of the latter, and communicated with each other.

"As soon as the mails were landed, a steamer went out for the passengers and their baggage. Early in the day the Collector of Customs telegraphed to the Board of Health, and he was ordered not to clear the Medway until Sir William Pym came to Southampton, which he was about to do immediately.

"The saddest accounts were brought by the Medway of the yellow fever in the West Indies. The Trent, packet, had lost two of her engineers, Mr. Nutt, midshipman, and several of her crew. Her second officer was invalided from fever, and had come home in the Medway.

"The Derwent also had been sickly, in spite of her recent trip to New York, having lost two hands while at St. Thomas. Indeed, the intense heat, added to prevalence of yellow fever at St. Thomas, has had a very fatal influence over every ship in the harbor.

"The Dee, on her voyage to the Gulf of Mexico, has lost several of her crew, among whom are her stewardess and French cook.

"The fever was on the increase in Barbadoes, and amongst the more recent sufferers were the son of the General, the Rev. E. Dixwood, Col. Williams (Royal Artillery), Mrs. Col. Wright, and many others. St. Thomas and Martinique, Guadeloupe and St. Lucia, together with Barbadoes, have been and are still suffering sadly from the horrid pestilence, to all appearance the same fever which has proved so fatal in Brazil. In Martinique nearly 300 troops had died out of 500; 90 had died in the French frigate at Port Royal; indeed, it is much to be feared that in its disastrous consequences this sickness will surpass any of late years."

[We feel morally convinced that our progress is one which must attract the attention of our Government, as well as others, very speedily; the sooner the better, for we have no hesitation in saying that an inquiry is demanded on the part of suffering humanity, in the broadest sense.

We conceive—nay, are prepared to prove—that the treatment of disease upon homœopathic principles will ultimately effect an amelioration of the condition of mankind generally, in our poor-rates and work-house system, and will tend to elevate the whole moral being of diseased humanity. Among the estimates voted in the House of Commons, we perceive that the sum of £1,200 was voted for physicking the seamen and marines alone. No doubt this will appear enormous to those who know what an amount of good can be accomplished with a small amount of medicinal expenditure; such of our brethren who are in the

secrets of allopathic polypharmacy, however, and who have been initiated into the secret of pretty tinctures, and other expensive preparations, which Homœopathy entirely laughs to scorn, will be prepared to look upon this enormous sum as nothing extravagant in the views of allopaths—allopaths in every sense of the word.

As our naval force too often becomes the prey of yellow fever, a successful mode of treating this formidable disease cannot fail to be of intense interest to all those whose business is on the deep waters. We have received by the last packet the following note with the West Indian journals, confirmatory of the information furnished by our contributor, who has favored us on the present occasion, and with a preceding paper on yellow fever. The fact of five, out of some thirty medical practitioners who exercise their calling in Barbadoes, having adopted Homœopathy, is very important. We wait for the fulfilment of our contributor's promise to furnish us with the homœopathic treatment of yellow fever. Our foreign correspondent thus writes:—

"Barbadoes, Nov. 11, 1852.

"SIR,—I have sent to your address two numbers of the *West Indian* newspaper, published here, giving some account of the homœopathic treatment of the epidemic of yellow or Bulam fever, which is now raging here. I think they will be the more interesting, as from all I can find, there has been very little homœopathic experience in the treatment of this disease before; and the successful treatment of any new and generally very fatal epidemic must tend to strengthen the public confidence in the new school of medicine.

"I had intended to address you at some length, on the rise and progress of Homœopathy in the island, but have been prevented from doing so by this opportunity, and do not like to lose the chance of putting you as early as possible in possession of the interesting facts alluded to.

"I can only now add, that in the last three years Homœopathy has taken root here, and that we have now five regularly-educated men practising it in different parts of the island, two of them in Bridgetown. Dr. GODING, whose letters are forwarded in the newspaper, is in high esteem here both as a physician and in private life, and his opinions are of weight."

CURE ME QUICKLY.

The "hot haste" of patients, in conjunction with relatives and friends, to have cures effected, is sometimes exceedingly embarrassing to physicians in the faithful performance of their difficult and important duties. It would be well for those who may have occasion for the services of medical men, to understand enough of diseases and their treatment to avoid this evil of which we complain, and thereby the interest of the sick will be promoted. We are fully convinced that all the premature deaths should not be placed in the responsibility of

physicians. Many injurious things have been done in the absence of medical attendants, and without their advice or sanction, which defeats cures. There is a class of persons who are meddlesome in the room of the sick. These persons assume to be competent to judge of diseases and their treatment, and do not hesitate, in the presence of the sick, to undertake a critical examination of the physician's doings, with a fixed purpose of disapproving of every measure he may have advised. These are mischief-makers of the worst sort, and should never be admitted to the room of the sick; for what evil they may not have an opportunity of doing by words, they will more effectually, perhaps, accomplish by actions. It often happens, as every experienced physician knows, that by the influence of these *croakers*, just at the *crisis* of a disease, when a few hours would show its decline, and a single day establish a convalescence, just at this moment the *croaker* urges the necessity of a consultation of his or her favorite physician; and as the friends and relatives of the sick do not perceive anything unreasonable in such advice, they yield, and although the counsel may not suggest any change in the treatment, yet convalescence coming on so soon after his visit, it is inferred that his skill was the cause of it, and thereby injustice is done to a truly worthy and a really skilful practitioner.

We would deal fairly with our opponents in the profession, knowing, as we do, that such evidence in favor of Homœopathy works injuriously to her interests. Therefore we do not regard those cases which have been under allopathic treatment, and have reached the *crisis* point, when they come under homœopathic, as very strong evidence for the latter. Under such circumstances, there are so many particulars which should be accurately ascertained to form a just opinion, that it is out of the question to attempt such an investigation with a hope of anything like a satisfactory result. We think it fair, therefore, to strike out all such testimony, because it is uncertain, and Homœopathy does not need it.

In connection, for the especial benefit of our lay readers, we remark that diseases are primarily a disturbance of the vital principle, which is only known by sensations and

actions, the causes of which are not accurately ascertained; hence the thousand speculations on the causes of disease are of but little practical value.

The injury (except mechanical) of solid parts, or the substance of the human body is the result of an unnatural, or, more properly speaking, diseased action. By causes which we will not attempt to name, for the reason, the profession knows but little of them, each individual has a vital force which, in some respects, differs from all other persons; and, although the human family resemble one another, yet no two are in all respects the same, neither in body nor in mind. The thousand causes of diseases, and the thousand combinations of these causes acting on every person, influence each one differently. And hence it is, no two persons with the same disease, have, in all respects, the same symptoms and sufferings. Observation and experience proves that whatever may be the causes of diseases, individuals are affected variously, owing, doubtless, to unknown peculiarities of constitution in each.

Much of what is recorded in medical works on the different constitutions, or, perhaps, it is best to say, temperaments, is almost worthless for practical purposes. The practitioner is compelled, therefore, to fall back on the facts as distinctly developed in individual cases, and employ the means which experience, guided by the established therapeutic law, has proved in the hands of the profession to be appropriate, and then patiently wait the result. We should not omit to mention those fixed diseases, small-pox, measles, etc., which are remarkably uniform in their course in all persons. Yet even in these maladies there are differences,—in symptoms—in severity, and in the period of a final recovery. On the whole, after due care has been observed in the selection of a physician in a case of sickness, it will be best to leave him to the entire management of the case, without fault-finding or urging him to hasten the cure, which he cannot do by increasing the force of his remedies, by the enlargement of the doses, and a more frequent repetition of them, which is the point usually urged by the laity. Such practice is dangerous, as every homœopathic physician knows, and with them there should be firmness enough to

resist promptly such unwise interference with their professional duties.

PHENOMENA AND THEORY OF INFLAMMATION,

IN CONNECTION WITH HOMOEOPATHIC STATISTICS.

By JOHN OZANNE, M. D.

(Continued from page 129.)

VI.

II. *Mercury in pneumonia. Influence of Mercury on the composition of the blood.*—Dr. Watson recommends *Mercury* in preference to *Tartar Emetic* in the second stage of pneumonia; that is to say, at the period when fibrinous exudations are taking place, or are accomplished.

"When, however, the inflammation has reached the second stage, that of solidification, *Mercury* is more worthy of confidence, in my opinion, than *Tartarized Antimony*. The object of giving it is to make the gums tender; and it is expedient to do this as speedily as may be Many persons, I am persuaded, are saved by treatment of this kind, pushed to slight ptyalism; the effusion of lymph, tending to spoil the texture of the lung, is arrested; and the lymph, already effused, begins to be again absorbed." (Lectures, vol. ii. p. 94.)

It is clear, from the following passage, that Dr. Watson looks upon *Mercury* as an *antiphlogistic* in the allopathic sense; as a destroyer of fibrin, and as a medicine tending to depress rather than to stimulate or tonify.

"After the inflamed lung has become solid and impermeable, the treatment must be regulated rather by the state of the system at large, than by the actual or presumed condition of the lung. We must look more for guidance to the general symptoms than to the physical signs. If the pulse continue steady and firm, wait patiently the effect of the *Mercury*. But when sunken features, a pallid face, coldness of the surface or extremities, a tendency to delirium, and, above all, a feeble or irregular pulse proclaim that the vital powers are giving way, it will be requisite, as in other cases where death is threatened by asthenia, to administer cordial and stimulant medicines—the *Carbonate of Ammonia* in a decoction of *Seneka*, wine, and to feed the patient well on milk* or beef tea." (pp. 94, 95.)

* It is one of the absurdities so often witnessed in allopathic practice, to imagine that one may at pleasure draw almost any quantity of blood in inflammatory disease, bring the patient as it were to death's door, and when it is found that life is fast flitting away, restore the vital powers by feeding "the patient well on milk or beef-tea," when he can digest neither of them!

But the use of *Mercury* as an antiphlogistic is not limited to pneumonia. "Of late years, various forms of inflammation have been most successfully combatted by the use of *Mercury*. Hence this mineral is termed an *antiphlogistic* It is principally valuable in *adhesive inflammation*, to stop, control, or prevent the effusion of *coagulable lymph*. On the other hand, it may prove injurious in erythematous, scrofulous, malignant, and gangrenous inflammations, accompanied with debility or great irritability of the nervous system." (Pereira, Mat. Med., 3d edit., vol i., p. 826.)

"*Mercury* is not equally serviceable in all inflammations Thus it appears that inflammations of membranous tissues are those principally benefited by a mercurial plan of treatment; and more especially those in which there is a tendency to the *exudation of coagulable lymph*, or of serous fluid, as meningitis, pleuritis, pericarditis, and peritonitis In inflammation of the tissues of the eye, particularly iritis, *Mercury* (next to blood-letting) is the only remedy on which much confidence can be placed; and we use it not merely with a view of putting a stop to the inflammatory action, but also *in order to cause the absorption of the effused lymph* In peripneumonia, more especially when hepatization has taken place, the best effects have sometimes resulted from its use; of course, after the employment of blood-letting. When hepatization has taken place, Dr. Davies recommends the use of *Blue Pill* and *Opium*." (pp. 826, 827.)

The above quotations, first, from a standard work on the practice of medicine, and, second, from an excellent compilation of the therapeutic opinions and knowledge of the day, sufficiently establish, we believe, the fact that *Mercury* is generally looked upon as the best antiphlogistic, next to blood-letting, in all the forms of inflammation which present in the highest degree the genuine inflammatory type; and as not only useful but indispensable for the prevention of fibrinous effusions, or their removal by absorption.

As a further illustration of the light in which the action of *Mercury* on the system is looked upon, we may adduce the fact, that it is rarely used in continued fever in such a manner as to produce a marked action upon the mouth, or if so used, it is only when inflammatory symptoms arise during the course of the fever. Thus Dr. Pereira says: "I have only used them (mercurial preparations) when there was some marked local determination or inflammatory condition." (Loc. cit., p. 825.)

As we wish to draw the reader's particular attention to this part of the theory and practice of allopathic medicine, we transcribe the following long extract from the work of a physician, whose talents for

the observation of disease, and power of illustration of individual cases, have long since won our warmest admiration. A work, too, which cannot be studied and meditated upon without fruit, by every close observer of disease, be his therapeutical notions what they may. On the use of mercurials in fevers, Dr. Graves expresses himself thus:

"These considerations, and others, have convinced me that the exhibition of *Mercury* in fever, *with the view of touching the gums*, is injurious and unnecessary. There are, however, cases in which you will be compelled to have recourse to *Mercury*, whatever the stage or the type of the fever may be. Whenever inflammation of some internal organ—as, for instance, of the lungs—arises during the progress of fever, you must employ *Mercury* at once; and cases of pneumonia, which would have proved fatal, have, on numberless occasions, been treated successfully by mercurialization. But under ordinary circumstances, and where there is no indication similar to that which I have just pointed out, I do not see any advantage to be derived from the use of *Mercury*. I am not, therefore, in the habit of employing *Mercury* in fever. Sometimes I use *Calomel* as an aperient, and I frequently prescribe small doses of *Hydrargyrum cum cretâ*, with the view of gently stimulating the liver, and preventing the tendency to congestion of the intestinal canal, but further than this I am not in the habit of going; and I never, except in cases of pneumonia, or inflammation of some internal organ, attempt to bring the patient's system under the influence of *Mercury* during the course of typhus (Graves, Clin Lect. on Pract. Med., vol. i., p. 165).

We thus find that when *Mercury* is so given as to produce a marked action upon the mouth, it is generally supposed to be useful in inflammations, and hurtful in fevers not complicated with inflammatory diseases.

Taking this broad view of the facts before us, and knowing, moreover, by the results of chemical analysis, that the essential difference between the blood in inflammation and that in fever consists in this: that in the former the fibrin is greatly increased, whereas in the latter it is unaffected, or, if affected, it is diminished in quantity. Taking these two circumstances together, it would follow, as a matter of course, if the principle *contraria contrariis curantur* were accepted as the rule of practice, that *Mercury* must diminish the proportion of fibrin in the blood. For, in order to restore the equilibrium in inflammation, in accordance with the allopathic principle, the remedial agent must necessarily be capable of diminishing, or in some way removing, that excess of fibrin in the blood in inflammations which chemical analysis renders manifest. If *Mer-*

cury is capable of doing that, we may of course grant, as a consequence of that power, that it may be capable likewise of removing fibrinous exudations (as it does in iritis and other diseases), in accordance with the principle *contraria contrariis curantur*. Let us, therefore, inquire into the views of allopathists respecting its curative properties.

Dr. Pereira classes *Mercury* among the "resolvent or liquefacient spancemics."

After giving the opinions of several authors, he says: "May not these remedies (*i. e.*, the liquefacient spancemics) act by correcting the quality of the blood in inflammation? It is now well known that the blood in this disease contains an abnormal quantity of fibrin, the quantity of which is diminished by the use of the liquefacient spancemics. Moreover, in buffy blood, the red corpuscles sink more rapidly than in healthy blood; a circumstance which Mr. Gulliver ascribes to their increased tendency to cluster or aggregate. Now, the salts tend to keep the corpuscles asunder; and to this cause Mr. Gulliver ascribes the efficacy of those agents in inflammation. Furthermore, the blood of an inflamed part contains an increased number of white globules, which have a remarkable disposition to adhere to the walls of the vessels, and to one another; and it is not improbable that the beneficial effects of resolvents and liquefacients may be due to their influence in diminishing the number and adhesiveness of these globules" (loc. cit., p. 176).

This is, as our readers will perceive, a theory of Dr. Williams, which Dr. Pereira fully adopts and mixes up with certain crude notions of the supposed curative effects produced by the separating properties of the solutions of salts; the whole based, be it observed, upon purely physical notions regarding the curative agent, and upon assumed facts, the fallacy of which we have fully proved, regarding the nature of inflammation.

Will the reader, with these facts before him, doubt the propriety of having recourse to experiments upon the healthy in order to discover the properties of drugs, as our great Master did? We do not think it possible that such a doubt should arise in his mind.

Had the allopathist Pereira, instead of attempting to prove that because *Mercury* cures inflammatory diseases, it must possess properties of a tendency the direct contrary of the tendency of the disease; and, instead of being tempted to adopt a theory of inflammation of the crudest description, resting, moreover, on facts which, at the time his first volume was written (1849), had been proved to be false, had he carefully considered some of the facts regarding the physiological action of *Mercury*, which he himself reports, and which we shall extract

from his work, he might perhaps have been led to adopt a principle of cure far different from the *law of contraries*—he might, like Hahnemann, have been led to the adoption of the principle *similia similibus curantur*!

Let us now proceed to inquire how we can explain the curative action of *Mercury* in inflammatory disease.

We shall derive our facts from two sources: from clinical observations, and from the analysis of the blood of persons to whom *Mercury* has been given in such a manner as to produce some marked action upon the mouth.

"During this state (mercurial salivation) the fat is rapidly absorbed, and the patient becomes exceedingly emaciated. *The blood, when drawn from a vein, puts on the same appearance as it does in inflammatory disease*" (Pereira, loc. cit., p. 814).

"*Soon after salivation has been established, the blood exhibits an inflammatory crust. At a later period its color deepens, and its coagulability is diminished; the proportion of clot, and therefore of fibrin, to serum becomes smaller*" (ibid).

We are not told how long after the fibrin begins to give way. But this is certain, that the pneumonic process lasts usually nine days; that from the time the hepatization is formed to the time that its termination, either in suppuration or in incipient resolution, has taken place, a period of at most three, four, or five days elapses; therefore, the very period when the *Mercury* is acting upon the system as a curative agent is that when it is found to produce a buffy coat on the blood, such as exists in blood drawn during the course of inflammation occurring spontaneously.

"According to Dr. Farre, it diminishes the number of the red globules of the blood" (ibid). Another point of similarity with inflammatory disease occurring naturally.

If, then, *Mercury* have the power to cure inflammatory disease, it can only be in accordance with the homœopathic law. But what are the results of chemical analysis? We find them in Andral (*Hématologie Pathologique*).

In four cases in which stomatitis occurred, as the result of the administration of *Mercury*, the blood was analysed, and gave the following proportions of fibrin:—

Case I. Slight stomatitis and copious salivation after the exhibition of twenty-four grains of *Calomel*. The proportion of fibrin was 4.5 (the normal proportion being at the very most 2.0) in 1000 parts.

Case II. A rather more decided stomatitis was produced by only twelve grains of *Calomel*. Pulse 100; temperature 39 per cent.; the proportion of fibrin was 5.0 in 1000 parts.

Case III. Stomatitis, more intense than the preceding, after mercurial frictions, and *Calomel* internally. Pulse 96; tempera-

ture 38.50 per cent. Proportion of fibrin 8.4 in 1000 parts.

Case IV. The same proportion as in the preceding case produced more intense stomatitis. Pulse 120; temperature 39 per cent. Proportion of fibrin 6.6 in 1000 parts. The patient had been bled a few days previously for "slight cerebral hemorrhage." The proportion of fibrin was then only 3.5. Thus the quantity of fibrin in the blood was doubled by the action of *Mercury*.

"Thus," says M. Andral, "mercurial stomatitis, in spite of its specific character, does not differ from ordinary inflammation with reference to the influence it exerts on the blood; and yet it has often been said that *Mercury* introduced into the system brings about a state of dissolution of the blood, which cannot co-exist with an increase of the fibrin.*

It may be that this may be so after a prolonged employment of this medicine; but it is assuredly not so for some time after its first being exhibited. Consequently, when it is employed in order to combat certain acute inflammation—peritonitis, for instance—we have no right to assume that its antiphlogistic action is dependent upon its producing in the blood a condition the opposite to that, which coincides in this fluid with the existence of an inflammatory state. Moreover, I do not see that this dissolving action on the blood, said to be produced by *Mercury*, has ever been demonstrated by a sufficiently rigorous examination of the blood in such cases" (pp. 89, 90).

We thus find as the results of our inquiry into the action of *Mercury* in inflammation, and into its action on the blood, in cases in which no inflammation existed before it was administered, that it produces the very changes in the blood which the inflammation itself produces, and which is characteristic of the inflammatory process, namely, a marked increase of the proportion of fibrin. This is a fact proved both by clinical observation and by the balance of the chemist.

We find, also, that when so administered as to produce a marked action upon the mouth, *Mercury* is considered by allopathists to be *beneficial in inflammation, and hurtful in fever*. Therefore, both in inflammation and in fever, its action is not in accordance with the principle *contraria contrariis curantur*.

We are thus led to frame the following propositions:—

1. There is no circumstance in the action

* Dr. Balfour, in his Report on the Vienna Hospitals, in the *British and Foreign Medical Review* (No. 44, p. 591), says of Professor Skoda, that "at present he is trying the new chemical theories and gives the patients *sublimite*, as in pneumonia. The above facts show that Skoda was in reality treating his pneumonic patients homœopathically."

of *Mercury* on the blood which tends in the least to show that it is either beneficial or indispensable in inflammatory disease, in accordance with allopathic principles.

2. On the contrary, everything tends to show that its curative action in inflammatory diseases, is in accordance with the law *similia similibus curantur*.*

III. *Tartar Emetic* in inflammation.

Pathogenetic action of Tartar Emetic.—

"We want some remedy, therefore," says Dr. Watson, "to assist the lancet, or to employ alone, when the lancet can do no more; and we have two such in *Tartarized Antimony* and in *Mercury*. The tartar-emic plan I believe to be the best adapted to the first degree of the inflammation, that of engorgement; and the mercurial plan to the second—to that of hepatization. . . . Under this plan of treatment the symptoms will often undergo a marked change for the better in three or four hours. Sometimes, however, the relief is not conspicuous for twenty-four or even for thirty-six hours" (Watson's Lect. on Physic, vol. ii. p. 93, 94).

On what principle does *Tartar Emetic* act curatively in pneumonia?

Dr. Routh tells us, that "allopathists, admitting the occasional truth of this doctrine *similia similibus curantur*, have given the larger dose. The experiments of Magendie have shown that *Tartar Emetic*, in doses of six to eight grains, will produce, among other lessons, pneumonia, if not rejected by vomiting. Every day's experience proves the efficacy of large doses of *Tartar Emetic* in curing pneumonia and other affections of the lungs" (Routh's Fallacies of Homœopathy, p. 6).

But M. Magendie's observations are contested. It is denied by others that *Tartar Emetic*, given in large doses to animals, ever produces hepatization of the lungs. We confess that we have the greatest respect for M. Magendie's authority as an experimental physiologist, and we believe that he cannot have been mistaken in asserting *Tartar Emetic* produces pneumonia. It may be that it does not usually produce hepatization. But at any

rate it produces a condition of the lungs exactly similar to that observed in the first stage of pneumonia.

But whether it be so or not, if *Tartar Emetic* is so beneficial in pneumonia, allopathists cannot claim it as an allopathic medication; for *Tartar Emetic*—witness its action on the skin, for instance—is a violent irritant. Now, on allopathic principles, it would be absurd to give irritants in inflammation! But this objection is so well expressed by Dr. Adams, in his edition of the works of Hippocrates (Syd. Soc. edition, London, 1849), that I cannot forbear from quoting his remarks.

"I am almost afraid further to put the question to the profession of the present day, whether or not the administration of antimonials in pleuro-pneumonia be an improvement on the ancient practice or the reverse? Shall we say, then, that experience has decided that this substance (*Antimony*), which, when applied to the cuticle, and to its prolongation, the epithelium of the stomach and bowels, occasions pain, heat, and vascular congestions, produces the very opposite effect on the lungs, when absorbed into the blood and conveyed to them? I dare not venture to answer these questions myself, but suggest them as deserving to be reconsidered, with serious impartiality, by the profession" (vol. i. p. 280).

It is clear then, that, whether we admit or not the authority of M. Magendie's experiments, we must conclude that—

1. The curative action of *Tartar Emetic* in pneumonia cannot be accounted for on allopathic principles; for it is in direct contradiction of them.

2. Although *Tartar Emetic* produces on the healthy subject symptoms similar to some of those observed in pneumonia, it is doubtful whether its effects can ever be said to be similar to fully-developed pneumonia. Hence it may be useful in pneumonia, but most probably is only entitled to occupy a very inferior position with regard to other drugs, in the homœopathic treatment of inflammation of the lungs.

IV. *Blisters in pneumonia: their influence on the composition of the blood.*—The beneficial influence of blisters upon pneumonia is, by many allopathists, held to be entirely unfounded. But there are various modes of blistering. We may use blisters of various sizes; some so small as to be capable of producing no constitutional effects; others so large as to produce marked febrile symptoms, together with various other symptoms. We may, therefore, take it for granted that the action of blisters, independently of their action upon the kidneys or urinary bladder, is proportionate to the extent of surface which they cover.

M. Andral, in his researches into the composition of the blood in various diseases, analysed the blood in persons who

* We may add that, considering the pathogenetic action of *Mercury* upon the blood, more especially in reference to its degree, we are led to look upon it as essentially homœopathic in those inflammations which do not present in the highest degree the characteristic phenomena of inflammation; for instance, it ought to be more useful in inflammations of mucous membranes, or of glandular structures. But it may, on these very grounds, be held to be serviceable when the intensity of the inflammation has been in a measure subdued by the action of other remedies. Thus, in inflammations of serous membranes, it ought, on these grounds, to be found of use after the employment of *Aconite* or of *Belladonna*. We believe these deductions, from the pathogenetic action of *Mercury* on the blood, to be worthy of consideration in practice, and perhaps in no case more than in some obscure forms of sub-acute intestinal inflammation.

presented burns of different extent. Thus, he says—

“Acute inflammations of the skin produce, just as well as inflammations of the mucous membrane, an increase of the proportion of fibrin in the blood, I have ascertained this increase in an individual who had an extensive burn; whereas it was wanting in another who had been burnt less severely and less extensively (*Hématol. Path.*, p. 92).

Further on, he says, of revulsive agents, and particularly of blisters—

“But another effect of these so-called revulsive agents, which has been less noticed, is that which they may have upon the composition of the blood, which they must modify, on account of the materials which they remove from this fluid. Thus, a large blister removes from the blood a certain quantity of its serum; but, in addition to this, fibrin is deposited on the surface of the sore produced by the action of *Cantharides*. When there exists in the blood a superabundance of fibrin, will this be the means of diminishing in the blood the excess of this substance? or else, on the contrary, if the action of the *Cantharides* be exerted over a large surface, if the inflammation which results from their application have much intensity, if, above all, the febrile movement already existing be increased, will there not result from it a new cause of superabundant formation of fibrin, and will not this cutaneous inflammation, produced artificially to diminish the intensity of another inflammation, by the influence which it exerts upon the composition of the blood, increase the morbid condition which represents in the blood the inflammatory state, and which manifests its intensity?” (*Loc. cit.*, p. 124.)

But it may be said that blisters large enough to produce such effects are never used. Here is what Dr. Watson says upon the subject:—

“A large blister is often productive of very sensible benefit; but it should be a large one. The patient should have a waistcoat almost, or at any rate a breast-plate of blistering plaster” (*loc. cit.*, p. 95).

Let the reader look again at M. Andral's remarks, and at Dr. Watson's recommendation, that if the blister be of any use it must be a very large one, and he will conclude with us—

1. That if blisters are of service in pneumonia, it is on principles in direct contradiction with the allopathic principle.

2. That if they be serviceable, it is in accordance with the law *similia similibus curantur*.

(To be continued.)

HOMŒOPATHY *viâ* YOUNG PHYSIC.

By J. RUTHERFURD RUSSELL, M.D.

(Continued from page 136.)

There can be no greater contrast than that presented by Dr. Forbes, as a destroyer and as a builder. Nothing can be clearer, more precise, more acute, than his objections to the systems or practice of others; but when he makes his own system known, he becomes vague and obscure in the extreme, and falls into declamation about the medical profession being “grand and glorious in its essence, aims and aspirations!” Wearied, it would seem, with the work of demolition, he sinks into the state described by Horace, when he says “*Auditis? an me ludit amabilis insania?*” and in the dim perspective he sees the future progeny of Young Physic flit past like Banquo's shadowy race, but cannot catch or paint their lineaments.

The system which is thus faintly suggested in the article of Dr. Forbes is more fully expounded by Dr. A. Combe, in his letter “On the Observation of Nature in the Treatment of Disease.” This letter is very remarkable for its candor and high moral tone. It contains also much truth, and shows that the writer, to some extent, perceives the real cause of the backward state of medicine when he says that “notwithstanding the ardor and success with which facts are sought for, yet, inasmuch as the ultimate facts remain unknown, the others lead to no useful result.” If, by ultimate fact, Dr. Combe means the largest possible generalisation—and this is the only idea that a disciple of Bacon can attach to the phrase—then we entirely agree with him, but we look upon the homœopathic principle as being that ultimate fact which he seeks. Although to a certain extent Dr. Combe feels the necessities of medicine, and truly says it is by the ascertainment of an ultimate fact, that is, a general law, that we can advance our science, yet the means by which he strives to reach the point of vantage are as vague as his general conception of what it would be, when gained, is just and exalted.

The system which Dr. Combe expounds is founded on a radical error in philosophy. His view is this: If we observe the progress of disease, we shall find that it runs a determinate course; it has its origin, its growth, and its decline; in these it obeys certain fixed laws given to it by the Creator. It is for man to learn these laws—to interpret these laws, but not to interfere with them. Nature alone cures, not man. It is presumptuous in man to usurp the prerogative of nature. Such seems the general drift of his opinions, as contained in the preceding article.

The great error contained in this view

consists in confounding the so-called laws of nature with the laws of a moral Creator.

The tap-root of the false school of philosophy to which Dr. Combe seems to belong, and which has recently been fully expounded in many popular works, is confounding the real obligation of man to obey the moral laws of his Creator with his assumed submission to the laws of the creation. The so-called laws of the creation have no existence out of the mind of man. They are but the summary expressions of his knowledge; they are but the ultimate facts or laws he has arrived at. "Ultimate laws," says Mr. Mill, "are observed uniformities of nature which cannot be resolved into more general laws."—*Mill's Logic*, vol. ii. p. 3. All that they express, in any case, is the constant relation of certain facts to certain other facts. This is all that gravitation expresses. Because gravitation is a law of nature, would any sane man argue that therefore it ought not to be interfered with? What is the whole active life of man, but a struggle with this great law of nature? What is death but a sinking under it—becoming obedient to it—being let down, pulled down, we might say, in submission to this grand natural law? It cannot, then, be argued, that because a process occurs in obedience to a law of physiology or pathology, that on that ground alone we ought not to interfere with it. It must be shown that it would be inexpedient to the patient if we did. This, which is the only real point at issue between us and the naturalists, Dr. Combe does not attempt to touch. He shows, indeed, that in certain cases it is very hazardous to use the ordinary depleting measures; but he does not even attempt to show that there are not, or may not be, means which are innocuous, yet potently beneficial. He does not show that there may not be a science of therapeutics, or curing; but he implies, from the position he at first assumes, that there cannot.

Miserable as are the conclusions Dr. Combe arrives at, we believe they are the logical consequences of working out Dr. Forbes' system; and for this reason we attach much value to his letter, independently altogether of the high and generous tone which pervades it, and which gives great weight to its influence over others. If ever medicine suffer utter degradation, it will be brought about by means of this new school. The leaders of the profession are engendering a scepticism in medicine which, unless counteracted, will blight it to the core. Practitioners of Physic will become divided into two classes—the one believing nothing, but yet acting as if they did, and giving the countenance of their high talents and acquirements to the rankest hypocrisy; the other class believing anything or every thing, but having no substantial grounds for their belief: cold, cultivated sceptics

will be the aristocracy, and ignorant but energetic dupes of their own credulity the democracy, of this noble and glorious profession. No wonder that one of Dr. Forbes' correspondents exclaims, "What more melancholy fact can be presented to the mere prescriber, when he first enters upon the duties of his benevolent profession with the enthusiasm of unsoured philanthropy, than the continual assurance of the Nestors of the profession, that the greater our experience the more positive our conviction that we can *do nothing*? And it only proves the immense force of habit that, with such convictions, we do not see men quit a profession which, under such circumstances, requires a constant exercise of hypocrisy, and a constant sacrifice of principle." There are examples of physicians being so conscientious, as to make the sacrifice, and one of these is Hahnemann.

While the great majority of those who have expressed their opinions on the state and prospects of medicine, agree in the main with Drs. Forbes and Combe, yet a few avow their dislike at being thus consigned to the negative pole of usefulness. The best exponent of the views of this class seems to be Dr. Bartlett, who says, "The seat, the character, and the tendencies of the disease being known, the next thing to be done is to find out the means of preventing, modifying, and of curing it." To do this, he goes on to say, "We must know the effects and influences which all substances and agencies in nature are capable of producing upon it, and this we can know only by direct observation of the effects themselves." That is, we may suppose medicine improved by a system of experimentation with individual drugs upon individual diseases. This is what another writer likewise proposes. Let us again apply to some philosopher of acknowledged reputation, to ascertain what may be expected from such experiments when not conducted in the light of some previous theory.

It most fortunately happens that the very case in point is used as an illustration by Mr. J. Stuart Mill, in his work upon logic. That highest modern authority upon the subject writes thus:—"Let the subject of inquiry be the conditions of health and disease in the human body, or for greater simplicity, the conditions of recovery from a given disease; and, in order to limit the question still more, let it be confined, in the first instance, to this one inquiry, Is, or is not a particular drug, mercury, for example, a remedy for that disease? * * * When we devise an experiment to ascertain the effects of a given agent, there are certain precautions which we never, if we can help it, omit. In the first place, we introduce the agent into the midst of a set of circumstances which we have exactly ascertained. It need hardly be remarked how

far this condition is from being realised in any case connected with the phenomena of life; how far we are from knowing what are all the circumstances which pre-exist in any instance in which mercury is administered to a living being. This difficulty, however, though insuperable in most cases, may not be so in all; there are sometimes (though I should think never in physiology) concurrence of many causes in which we yet know accurately what the causes are. But when we have got clear of this obstacle, we encounter another still more serious. In other cases, when we intend to try an experiment, we do not reckon it enough that there be no circumstances in the case, the presence of which is unknown to us; we require also that none of the circumstances which we do know of shall have effects susceptible of being confounded with those of the agent whose properties we wish to study; we take the utmost pains to exclude all causes capable of composition with the given cause; or, if forced to let in any such causes, we take care to make them such that we can compute and allow for their influence, so that the effect of the given cause may, after the subduction of those other effects, be apparent as a residual phenomena. These precautions are inapplicable to such cases as we are now considering.

* * * *Anything like a scientific use of the method of experiment in these complicated cases is therefore out of the question. We can, in the most favorable cases, only discover, by a succession of trials, that a certain cause is often followed by a certain effect.*"—Mill's Logic, vol. 1. p. 529. We find, then, that logic as unceremoniously discards the experimental method proposed by Dr. Bartlett, as philosophy condemned the statistical method sanctioned by Dr. Forbes. Indeed, the two methods are very nearly allied, the one almost invoking the other; and if they both be abandoned, and if young physicians be not content with being the mere spectators of disease, and superintenders of the diet and ventilation, and revolt at the idea of hospitals for the cure of the sick being nothing but museums for the study of morbid natural history and registries of mortality, to what side are they to turn for escape from the alternatives presented to them? How shall they be followers of nature and yet energetic? How shall they know all that is to be known, and not be sceptical, and do all that is to be done, and not be dangerous?

If the simple observation of the natural course of disease; if the application of the numerical method to all recorded cures; if experiments with various medicines upon various diseases, are each and all fallacious modes for the improvement of medicine, what conceivable method yet remains by which it may be raised from its present uncertainty to become amenable to known

laws, by which it may be worked? The answer to this we have already anticipated, at the commencement of our article. The accumulation and complexity of facts in medicine rendering the inductive process inapplicable, it is absolutely necessary, for the regeneration of the science, that some successful hypothesis be made which shall express the law of relation between the curative and some other discoverable property of a given drug, by which we may know beforehand what we are to select in a given case of disease. There has been but one such attempt in medicine (for we need not stop to show that the old Galenic maxim, "*Contraria contrariis opponantur*," is not such an hypothesis, involving, as it does, the previous ascertainment of conditions as impossible to recognise, as they are incapable of being tested), that is, *that medicines tend to cure diseases similar to those they tend to produce*.* This is a perfect hypothesis for the circumstances, because it embraces all the circumstances coming within the range of medication, and it is possible to establish the truth or falseness of it by experiment.

(To be continued.)

THE MEANS BY WHICH DISEASES ARE CURED, NOT ALWAYS KNOWN.

It is not easy in some cases, to come to a decision by what means the cure was accomplished. It may have been mainly by medicine, or by diet, or by both, or by the vital force alone.

In many cases, a true answer to the question cannot be given, owing to a variety of measures employed at the same time, or what amounts to that, in quick succession. The readiness, or rather, we would say, the careless, off-hand way physicians pretend to decide what effected the cure in individual cases of disease, leads to serious error and to great confusion, and is an obstacle to the progress of the science and art of medicine. Comparatively few of the reported cases will stand the test of a critical examination, as to the agents whereby the pretended results were obtained.

A sick person's case is drawn up accurately, embracing its history and symptoms, but the treatment may be of numerous drugs, of different dilutions of each, administered at short intervals. Now, in the

* We believe this is the most accurate way of stating the law of Homœopathy, and it would obviate many objections if this mode of expressing it were generally adopted.

midst of this confusion, the practitioner undertakes to say, which was the remedy—which drug was the curative cause; but this is impossible, and therefore such cases are of no practical value; they amount to nothing more than the facts from which no inferences can be drawn for a guide in similar cases. Such cases amount to this: A. B. was attacked by a disease with distinctly marked symptoms, for the cure of which many drugs were given him in large and small doses, at intervals varying in time, from a half hour to four hours, for several weeks, and finally recovered his health. Homœopathy certainly gains nothing by such cases for they do not show the remedy. If each drug had any agency in it, then there is such a mingling of drug actions that the confusion is such, the law of cure cannot be recognized.

There is no need for homœopathists to report cases where the curative agent is not distinctly perceived. They should be cautious not to report any case that cannot bear the test of the strictest scrutiny.

A FEW THOUGHTS ON CONSUMPTION.

In our last issue we proved that an improper use of *Mercury* tends to develop *tubercular* consumption. We now propose by well established facts to show that the *Peruvian bark*, or *Quinine*, which is thought to be, in its effects in the human system, very similar to the *Peruvian bark* of which it is made. The trial of the *Bark* by numerous individuals in health, is known to cause the following symptoms, viz: "Great general weakness, with trembling. Great tendency to perspiration during movement and sleep. Over-excitability of the whole nervous system. Atrophy and emaciation, especially of the arms and legs. Heat, with dryness of the mouth, and of the lips. Nocturnal debilitating sweats. Desire for a variety of food, and confused longing for dainties, without knowing exactly for which. Hoarseness, indistinct speech, and low voice when singing in consequence of mucus difficult to detach from the larynx. Suffocating, nocturnal cough, with pains in the chest and in the shoulder-blades, so as to extort cries. Cough by breathing deeply. On coughing, expectoration, streaked with blood. Difficulty of respiration and great

oppression on the chest. Fits of suffocation from mucus in the larynx, especially in the evening, and at night on waking. Respiration difficult, and possible only when lying with the head very high. Shootings in the chest, on coughing and on breathing. Stitches in the side. Great congestion in the chest, and violent palpitation of the heart. Swelling of the feet."

Inasmuch as most of the above symptoms are found in cases of consumption, it is fair to infer that where a predisposition hereditarily exists, the administration of the *Peruvian bark* in large and repeated doses, or even in moderate ones, may cause a development of that disease, as the most experienced physicians know from observation. We can state, that in our own practice we have noticed for years past, that almost every case, the exceptions being very few, where salivation from mercury had taken place, and in some instances, although years after the salivation, mercurial symptoms were still present. In other cases *Peruvian bark* or *Quinine* had been freely used, and on a careful examination, some of the symptoms of those drugs could be detected, although, as in *Mercury*, a long time had elapsed since they had been taken. Again, we have met with numerous cases where *Mercury* and *Quinine* both had been previously used, which caused a state of things rapidly destructive of life, for in these cases it is exceedingly difficult to even palliate the sufferings, and then only for a short time, by large doses of opium or some of its preparations, which in the end make things worse, by causing *opium* symptoms, which, in those already poisoned by *Mercury* and *Quinine*, are very violent, and render life most wretched; causing the sufferer to desire death for relief. As regards homœopathic remedies in such conditions, we may as well say they do not exist. It is out of the question among the two hundred drugs named in the *Materia Medica*, to find one or even a number combined to correspond to the symptoms of those who have *mercurial*, *quinine* and *tubercular* symptoms existing at the same time; the two drugs acting to promote a suppurative process in the tubercles. Such cases are not only incurable, but they cannot even be palliated.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth.

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, MARCH, 1853.

NO. 11.

S. R. KIRBY, M. D., EDITOR.

HOMŒOPATHY *viâ* YOUNG PHYSIC.

By J. RUTHERFURD RUSSELL, M.D.

(Continued from page 151.)

How vain and ignorant it is of those who profess themselves philosophic practitioners, to reject this proposition, and to stigmatise the practice thence flowing, on the ground of its being at the first hypothetical, is shown from the fact that all complex sciences have become perfect by means of some successful hypothesis. What was Kepler's law of planetary motion, which has introduced such accuracy into astronomy, that the accession of a new member to our system can now be infallibly predicted, but an hypothesis verified by calculation? What was Dalton's atomic theory, which has given such systematic beauty to chemistry, but an hypothesis verified by calculation? What was Torricelli's grand discovery of the pressure of the atmosphere, which introduced a new era in physics, but an hypothesis verified by an experiment? It is the same with Hahnemann's great law of medicine—it is an hypothesis proved true by its results.

Had Dr. Forbes and his followers been alive to the necessity of such a discovery, had they perceived that *it was not a Bacon, but a Newton, that medicine stood in need of*, they would have formed a very different estimate of the grandeur of Homœopathy; they would not have harped with puerile pertinacity upon the assertion that Hahnemann was mistaken in supposing that the symptoms of ague he felt stood in relation of cause and effect to the doses of cinchona bark he had previously taken. They would have perceived that it was of very little consequence what gave rise in the mind of Hahnemann to an hypothesis which, if substantiated, would make medicine a deductive science, instead of an empirical one; and they would have directed all their energies to ascertain whether this hypothesis be true or false; for, if true, it must for ever change the whole character of their art.

There were three possible ways open for disproving the truth of Homœopathy: first,

by showing that it was opposed to some already established natural law; second, by showing that the facts on which it rested its claims for belief were either false or too few; third, that when tried as a guide in practice, it led to failure.

The first way was never attempted. No one has yet ventured to assert that the proposition that, a medicine tends to cure diseases similar to those it tends to excite, is radically opposed to any general fact. Nay, were this the place for it, it would not be difficult to demonstrate, that this primary law of Homœopathy presents many striking and interesting analogies with some of the most important doctrines that have recently been advanced by the greatest writers in the various fields of physics, ethics, and psychology.

Neither Dr. Forbes, nor any of his school, have devoted themselves to the task of undertaking the second way, and showing that there is not a marked similarity between the curative and noxious effects of very many drugs. Nay, Dr. Forbes himself admits, in these words, that there is such a resemblance. "Indeed, it is supported by several strong analogies, afforded both by pathology and (allopathic) therapeutics."

The only other way which remained was to show, that where this law had been applied for the cure of diseases, it had entirely failed to effect its object. How far our opponents have succeeded in this, we leave those to determine who have carefully and critically studied Professor Henderson's letter to Dr. Forbes, as well as the evidence from which his arguments are drawn.

Hitherto we have contemplated Homœopathy as an abstract scientific truth, "won from the void and formless infinite" by the genius of its discoverer—a truth which would remain the same, although disease were to disappear, and there were no occasion for its application to human affairs; and we have considered the reason why the value of this truth has not been appreciated by the foremost men in our profession. But between such an abstraction and the requirements of daily life, there lies the province of art. The truth might be revealed, but might remain for ever unprofitable to us, if we were not instructed

in the mode of its application. Art is to science what action is to thought. The discovery of the law of Homœopathy made medicine as a science perfect; it required another discovery before an element of perfection was imparted to medicine as an art. Discoveries in art are of a wholly different kind from those in science. They are simply empirical rules obtained from observations or experiment, and proved true by experience. They never can have the same absolute value as fundamental principles, nor are they susceptible of the same amount of proof. The rules of art occupy, as it were, a middle point between science and its application. They rest upon a surface of fluctuating observations, and they derive their coherence and stability from a source different from that of their origin. That source is the abstract scientific truth to which they are united. In estimating the value of these rules of art, it is necessary always to keep in view this, their double connection; and it would be as unfair to judge of them, separated from their connection with the scientific principles which gives them support, as it would be to insist upon a child living in its mother's womb after the umbilical cord had been divided. This is the injustice which has been practiced upon the rule of art connected with the science of Homœopathy;—the rule that medicines when administered in accordance with the principle "*similia similibus*," should be given in minute quantities. If the proposition had been advanced that medicines, in doses infinitely minuter than had even hitherto been imagined, were capable of curing diseases, as a simple fact of observation, it might fairly have been met with the ridicule that has assailed it. But when advanced under the protection of a more general proposition, it ought to have been always viewed as related to that general fact; and in that light, whether it be true or false, it ceases to be ridiculous.

While, then, we charge Dr. Forbes with committing a fundamental error in philosophy, by not appreciating the necessity of some general hypothesis by which the science of medicine may be made deductive, we charge him and his followers with a second error in judging a rule of art without taking into consideration the cognate scientific principle from which it derives half its force. This misapprehension of the proper point of view, on the part of all English writers, from which the system of giving small doses ought to be regarded, is the less excusable, since those who have adopted their side of the controversy in Germany have admitted and given full prominence to the fact, that the dose must vary according to the principle by which the medicine is selected. "On the other hand," observes Dr. Jörg, "medicines operate most powerfully upon the sick when the

symptoms correspond with those of the disease. A very small quantity of medicinal arnica will produce a violent effect upon persons who have an irritable state of the œsophagus and stomach. Mercurial preparations have in very small doses given rise to pains and loose stools, when administered in an inflammatory state of the intestines. Yet why," he exclaims, "should I occupy time by adducing more examples of a similar operation of medicines, since it is in the very nature of the thing that a medicine must produce a much greater effect when it is applied to a body already suffering under an affection similar to that which the medicine itself is capable of producing?"

Another great error which the various writers upon the subject have fallen into, when treating of minute doses, is confounding the amount of force required to originate a series of changes in the animal system, and that which is required to modify those changes where already going on. It is, if we may so express it, applying to a question of dynamics calculations derived from data afforded by statistics. Contented as the disciples of Young Physic are with allowing morbid processes to proceed without any intervention, and simply supporting the powers of life, that the system may not sink under the continuance of the disease; and accustomed as they and all allopathic physicians are to look upon therapeutic agents as operations beyond, or on the outside of, the sphere of the actual morbid forces (the derivative system of medicine), they do not perceive that, if it be possible to introduce a force within the actual sphere of diseased action, that force will be incalculably intensified in its operation by acting on other forces already in a state of preternatural and violent activity. A breath of air will deflect an arrow from its course, although shot from the bow of Apollo. We do not intend to dwell upon the point last mooted, partly because our space is exhausted, and partly because they have already been fully and ably handled by various writers. We would here recommend a recent popular work by Dr. Henry Madden, which contains a good exposition of this part of the subject.

Before we close this fragmentary and elliptical paper, the design of which has been rather to discover, if possible, and to indicate the chief sources of the errors of our opponents, and in this very search to point to the refutation of these errors, than to expose, by argument, the numerous fallacies which have marked their winding course throughout the controversy, we wish to do full justice to Dr. Forbes. We look upon him as the ablest exponent of the sceptical era in medicine. He expresses for the medicine what others have done for the philosophy of our period, which has been characterised as "an age of unbelief,

and yet afraid of scepticism." By giving expression to prevailing scepticism in medicine, Dr. Forbes has rendered an immense benefit to the profession; *he has brought out and made curable the hitherto latent psora.* The element of faith which he would fain mingle with his confession of general unbelief is too foreign to the rest of the system to have any influence upon his disciples. The reform he has so powerfully advanced will soon become a revolution beyond his power to control. His influence for the future will be purely destructive. But destruction of the bad must precede construction of the good; and for having with great talent and boldness attacked and shaken a dynasty whose speedy termination is with certainty predicted by this revolt of its chief supporter, for having rendered this service, and opened the gate of scepticism for the admission of truth, we feel deeply indebted to him, and we have no doubt that his school will prove to many the halting-place between Old Physic and Homœopathy.

ANNUAL MEETING

Of the Homœopathic Medical Society of the State of New-York.

The Annual Meeting of the Homœopathic Medical Society of the State of New-York was held, as required by the Constitution, at Albany, on Tuesday, the 8th of February.

The Society met in the City Hall, and at ten o'clock was called to order by the President, Dr. Lyman Clary. There was a very respectable attendance, about forty members answering to their names at the calling of the roll.

The minutes of the previous meeting having been read and approved, about twenty new members were elected.

Some other preliminary business having been transacted, it was moved and carried that the next order of business (reports from committees) be postponed for the present in order to receive communications in answer to the resolution passed at the last meeting, requesting each member to report at this meeting at least one case cured in his practice by a single remedy.

Reports of cases were then read by Drs. Humphreys, Metcalf, Guy, L. B. Wells, Weeks, H. D. Paine, A. C. Hull, and Boyce. Many other statements were offered, but not being in writing were not allowed.

These communications were, on motion, referred to the Bureau of Materia Medica.

Dr. Metcalf read, for the information of the society, an account of the effort now making for the establishment of a Homœopathic Hospital in the City of New-York.

These proceedings having occupied the attention of the Society till the hour of dinner, a recess was taken till half-past three, P. M.

Afternoon Session.

The Society having again met at the hour designated, the regular order of business was resumed.

The Bureau for the enlargement and improvement of the Materia Medica presented, through their chairman, Dr. Humphreys, an elaborate report, giving the results of the provings that had been conducted under their supervision, and in accordance with their suggestions, during the past year. More or less thorough trials had been made of the following drugs: viz., APIS MELLIFICA, CIMICIFUGA RACEMOSA, UREA, TITANIC ACID, and URANIUM.

The report was accepted and the committee requested to continue their labors.

The following resolutions, which were appended to the report, were then considered, and, after some discussion, adopted.

Resolved, That each member of the Society be requested to make a proving of at least one drug upon himself during the year, and to report the result of such proving to the Bureau of Materia Medica before the first of January next.

Resolved, That it be recommended especially that further provings be made of the following: viz., APIS MELLIFICA, PLANTAGO MAJOR, CIMICIFUGA RACEMOSA, UREA, URANIUM, TITANIC ACID, and GERANIUM MACULATUM.

Resolved, That each member be requested to report in writing, at each meeting, at least one case cured in his practice by a single remedy.

Dr. Guy, from the committee appointed to consider the proper mode of conducting drug provings, read an interesting and able report, but as the committee still considered it incomplete, it was, upon motion of Dr. Metcalf, referred back to them, with the request that they would continue the consideration of the subject and report at the next meeting.

Dr. Metcalf was added to the committee.

Dr. H. D. Paine, from the committee

appointed to consider the expediency of procuring an act of incorporation for the Society, reported that the general law appeared to meet all the necessities of the case, and offered a resolution authorising the President and Secretary to take the necessary measures for that purpose, which was adopted.

The Committee on the subject of a Homœopathic Medical College presented an elaborate report, which, in the absence of the chairman, (Dr. Ball,) was read by Dr. Humphreys.

The report, after viewing the subject in various aspects, comes to a conclusion favorable to the establishment of such an institution in the City of New-York, and recommends that early steps be taken to secure that object, in accordance with which the committee offers the following resolution.

Resolved, That a committee of seven be appointed, whose duty it shall be to nominate a board of trustees, procure a charter, and raise the funds for the establishment of a medical college in the City of New-York.

The report and its accompanying resolution gave rise to a considerable debate, in which Drs. Kirby, Metcalf, Perkins, Guy, Weeks and others, participated.

The resolution was, however, finally adopted, and the following members appointed on the committee: Drs. Ball, Beakley, Humphreys, Childs, Metcalf, Clary and Kirby.

After the transaction of some other business not of general interest, the Society proceeded to the election of officers for the ensuing year, with the following result:—

A. S. BALL, M. D., of New-York, President.

N. H. WARNER, M. D., of Buffalo, 1st Vice President.

S. S. GUY, M. D., of Brooklyn, 2d Vice President.

L. B. WELLS, M. D., of Utica, 3d Vice President.

H. D. PAINE, M. D., of Albany, Secretary.

The President announced that he had appointed Dr. B. F. Joslin, of New-York, to deliver the Annual Address before the Society, and also that the use of the Assembly Chamber had been granted to the Society for this evening.

After consultation it was decided to hold

the semi-annual meeting in the City of Utica, on the first Friday in June.

Dr. Guy moved the thanks of the Society to Dr. Clary for his able and impartial conduct as President, which having been unanimously acceded to, Dr. Clary acknowledged in appropriate terms.

The meeting then adjourned till seven o'clock, P. M.

Evening Session.

At the hour appointed the Society met in the Assembly Chamber of the Capitol. There was also present a highly respectable audience of ladies and gentlemen, members of the Legislature, &c.

Dr. Joslin having been introduced by the President, proceeded to deliver his address.

After which Dr. Springsteed moved that the thanks of the Society be offered to Dr. Joslin for his able and lucid address, and that a copy of the same be requested for publication.

The motion was unanimously adopted.

On motion, it was ordered that 1500 copies of the address, together with the proceedings of this and the previous meeting, the Constitution and By-Laws, and a list of the members, be printed for the use of the Society.

The Society then adjourned *sine die*.

HENRY D. PAINE, *Secretary*.

THE SMALL DOSE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

By WILLIAM SHARP, F.R.S., LONDON.

"Knowledge is more beautiful than any apparel of words which can be put upon it."—LORD BACON.

"God is my witness, and all good men know that I have now labored fifty years with all care and pains in the illustration and amplification of my art; and that I have so certainly touched the mark whereat I aimed, that antiquity may seem to have nothing wherein it may exceed us beside the glory of invention, nor posterity any thing left but a certain small hope to add some things, as it is easy to add to former inventions."

"So thought, about three centuries ago, the celebrated surgeon AMBROSE PARE; and so think many in the present day. But it is in vain. Knowledge, notwithstanding, has increased, and is still increasing. At the very moment when PARE was expressing his self-complacent satisfaction, the veil which had covered the eyes of Europe for so many ages was being torn away; and at

the present time the limits of our intellectual vision are being extended more rapidly than at any previous period of the history of the world.

"If any one would see and participate in this progress of human knowledge, he must make an effort to free himself from the prejudices of education, from the power of preconceived opinion, and from the influence of habits of thought, and resolve to admit every conclusion which appears to be adequately supported by careful observation.

"The subject I have now undertaken is one of acknowledged difficulty. I think no one can have *felt* this difficulty more than myself. I shall be happy if I succeed in reducing it within its proper dimensions. For this purpose, after a few remarks on the general character and extent of our knowledge of natural things, to state the case and its difficulty, and then proceed to answer the three following questions:—

"I. Are we acquainted with any facts which render it probable that infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter *may* act upon the living animal body? In other words, what does analogy teach us?

"II. Are there any facts which show the action of infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter on the *healthy* body?

"III. What are the actual proofs in support of the assertion that such minute quantities of ponderable matter act remedially on the *diseased* body?

"Our knowledge of nature is obtained by observing facts or events, and their succession, by our bodily senses. Our ideas of external objects are produced by the impression which those objects are capable of making upon our minds, through the instrumentality of our senses. We can observe and experiment upon these facts or events, and the manner in which they succeed each other, to the extent which our senses permit us, but no further. The limit of the powers of our corporeal senses is the limit of our knowledge. This limitation is absolute. For example:—

"Sound is produced by vibrations of the air striking upon the organs of hearing. The various musical notes, from the lowest to the highest, are produced by the varying rapidity of these vibrations. The gravest sound is produced by about thirty vibrations in a second, the most acute by about a thousand. Each series of vibrations of the particles of the air is a fact or natural event, and when it strikes our ear we become acquainted with its existence by the sound perceived, provided the number of vibrations is not below thirty nor above a thousand in a second. These are the limits of our powers of observation of vibrations of the air. That there are vibrations slower than thirty and more rapid than a thousand in a second, cannot be doubted; and that there are living beings capable of

perceiving them, is probable—the hare for example—but to us they are as though they did not exist.

"The same is true of the eye and the observation of colors. The vibrations of the ether (according to the undulatory theory of light) produce impressions upon the organ of seeing, and the varying rapidity of these vibrations enables us to perceive the different colors. The limits are still narrower than those of sound. The whole scale of color, from violet to crimson, lies between vibrations which number 458 millions of millions (or billions) and 727 millions of millions in a second. That there are vibrations of the luminiferous ether, varying in frequency beyond these two extremes, must be almost certain, and that there are eyes which can feel their impression is probable,—the owl and the bat, for example,—but to us they are as though they were not. We shall never, in this life, hear new sounds, nor see new colors.

"The senses of smell and touch are similarly limited. The hound can smell and the insect can touch what we cannot.

"In two ways art has rendered assistance to our sense of sight. We stand upon the deck of a ship, while crossing the Atlantic, our eye takes in a considerable prospect of the surrounding waters, the telescope extends this prospect; still, in either case, it has positive limits, which are dependent upon the powers of the eye. This prospect, vast as it seems to us at the time, bears a very small proportion to the real extent of the ocean.

"Again, bodies soon become divided till their particles are too small for the naked eye to perceive them. That they still exist, and are susceptible of much further subdivision, is rendered certain by the aid which the microscope affords us; we can now follow them with the eye till they are millions of times less than before; but our vision again ceases—we lose the particle—yet we cannot conclude that it has ceased to exist, or ceased to be divisible. There are animals as small as this particle, and the atoms of which they are made up must be considerably less than themselves. The particle we have lost may be capable of further division indefinitely; so that the divisions we can see may bear a much smaller proportion to those we cannot see, than the prospect which the deck of a ship affords us does to the rest of the unseen ocean.

"Beyond these limits our knowledge of external things cannot extend; they are impassable boundaries. We see how near they approach each other, and consequently how finite our knowledge is.

"Besides these there are limits of another kind which require to be noticed. They will be best explained, as the former have been, by an example or two.

"On the discovery of oxygen gas it was

concluded by LAVOISIER to be an element necessary to the processes of combustion and acidification; to be the sole supporter of combustion and the sole generator of acids; hypotheses were constructed and the name given accordingly. This was the limit of our knowledge on this subject at the time. A few years later it was discovered that a leaf of copper takes fire spontaneously and burns in chlorine gas, and that hydrogen and chlorine combine and form a powerful acid. Here then was a real extension of our knowledge.

"If we collect in a strong vessel two volumes of hydrogen and one of oxygen, it is well known that the contact of flame or an electric spark will cause an explosion, the gases disappear and a drop of water is produced. For some time it was believed that the agency of heat or of electricity was requisite to produce these mechanical and chemical phenomena. But it was afterwards found that if we insert a piece of cold spongy platinum into the mixture, this is sufficient to occasion the gases to explode, and the drop of water to be produced. Thus the previous limits of our knowledge were extended.

"These examples show that our knowledge of nature has not only a fixed limit, dependent on the powers of our bodily senses, but that it is also limited by a sliding scale, dependent upon the industry with which we use these powers. This is the boundary which has already so often been extended; these are the barriers which we may still hope to throw down.

"The small dose of the homœopathist, viewed in the light of this double limit, may be thus considered:—chemical tests follow the grain of medicinal substance to the third trituration, that is, till it has been divided into a million of parts, and a good eye, assisted by a powerful microscope, can follow it to the fourth or fifth trituration, beyond this it is absolutely lost to the perception of our sight. The sense of smell can detect musk to the fifth or sixth dilution. Everything that we know forbids us to conclude that the division of matter stops here, but our senses cannot follow it further. On the other hand, our power of observing the effects produced by these doses has no limit but that of the sliding scale. Admitting for the moment, what I think I shall afterwards prove, that effects are produced, it is evidently as easy for us to observe them after a dose of the thirtieth as after one of the third or of the first trituration. The same cautions are necessary, but nothing more.

"Another feature in the character of our knowledge of natural things is our ignorance of *modes of action*. This also is a result of the very limited powers of our bodily senses. The succession of events can be traced only

for a few links, and we cannot discover how even these are connected together.

"A lucifer match is rubbed on a rough surface and it inflames. *How* friction produces such a result we know not. If it be said that friction evolves heat, and that heat inflames the match, the question returns, *how* does friction evolve heat? and *how* does heat inflame the match? No one can tell.

"No fact is better ascertained than that the moon is kept in its orbit round the earth, and the earth in its orbit round the sun, by the same force as that which causes a stone or an apple to fall to the ground. These bodies are separated by immense distances, how can they act upon each other? How is it possible for an inert lump of matter to influence another inert lump a hundred millions of miles off? It is by the force of gravitation; but what is gravity? and how does it act? We know not.

"If we throw a piece of the metal potassium upon ice, it instantly inflames, burns itself into the ice and disappears. Part of the ice has been melted, the water decomposed, its hydrogen burnt, and its oxygen has united with the metal and formed a portion of caustic potash, which is all that remains in the cavity of the ice. These extraordinary phenomena are the effect of chemical affinity, but what is that? and how does it act? No one can inform us.

"We can surround a seed with suitable proportions of air, warmth, and moisture, and can observe the gradual development of the germ, of the entire plant, and of the ripening seed. *How* have all these wonderful changes been effected? they are attributed to the vital force, but we know not in the least what this is, nor how it acts. We can examine the various tissues with our microscopes, and analyse them in our laboratories, and thus become acquainted with many new and beautiful facts, which have presented themselves in the course of the growth of our experimental plant. When we have reduced the mechanism to the simplest form, we find that it consists of minute vesicles, formed by an elastic transparent membrane composed of a substance somewhat resembling starch, and called *cellulose*. When we have obtained the ultimate chemical analysis, we find certain proportions of carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen, with occasionally an addition of nitrogen, sulphur, phosphorus, and a few metals or metallic oxides. We find nothing which reveals to us what *vitality* is, nor *how* the successive changes we have witnessed have been brought about.

"We take food and are nourished; we take medicines and are acted upon by them; we take poisons and die; but *how* these things act so as to produce such effects we know not.

“What is the cause of health? and the gendering of disease?

Why should arsenic kill? and whence is the potency of antidotes?

Behold a morsel,—eat and die; the term of thy probation is expired;

Behold a potion,—drink and be alive; the limit of thy trial is enlarged.’

TUPPER.

“If it be said that our food is converted into chyme in the stomach, and into chyle in the intestines, that this is absorbed by the lacteals and conveyed by the thoracic duct into the blood, and that thus we are nourished, I reply, all this is granted, but what then? The question remains as it was; *how* is all this done? No one can tell.

“Again, if it be said that medicines act on the nervous system, and stimulate the stomach, that they are sedatives and stimulants, emetics and purgatives, sudorifics and expectorants; what of all this? What are all these stimulating powers? how do they produce their effects, and how are these effects beneficial? No answer is given.

“The succession of events,—the steps by which an ultimate result is produced,—these, *within the limits described*, may be observed and experimented upon, but *how* each step is accomplished is beyond our ken. Of the recesses of Nature, of the secret chambers in which her operations are carried on, how forces are “correlative,” how they can be changed into each other, how they act upon matter, how matter acts upon them, we are profoundly ignorant. Nevertheless, we believe what we see, without waiting till we can explain it.

“Such is the actual condition, the general character and extent of our knowledge of nature, and this consequence follows;—we are not entitled to reject anything which professes to be a *fact*, if supported by a sufficient amount of evidence, merely because it is inconsistent with our expectations, does not coincide with our previous opinions, or is not within the limits of our former experience. We are not justified in concluding against a statement of fact by *à priori* reasoning or theoretical considerations. Analogies may render an assertion probable or the contrary, but no reasoning is conclusive against a matter of fact. The truth or falsehood of the announcement of a fact cannot be settled by reasoning or argumentation, it must be decided by evidence.

“The case to be stated is this:—when a remedy has been chosen in accordance with the law of Homœopathy, an inconceivably small quantity is often a sufficient dose.

“The difficulty lies in the incredibility of this statement.

“Be it well observed that the matter in hand is not to account for the efficacy of the small doses, but to prove that they are efficacious. The difficulty is not how to explain their action, but how to believe it.

“A story is told of the Royal Society,

that on a certain occasion it was proposed to that learned body to explain how it was that, when a live fish was put into a basin quite full of water, none overflowed. After sundry grave hypotheses had been propounded and objections urged, it was at length proposed to try the experiment. So with this medical difficulty; leaving explanations, let us first try the experiment as a matter of fact. The whole case is embraced by the three questions already proposed.

“I. Are we acquainted with any facts which render it probable that infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter *may* act upon the living animal body? In other words, what does analogy teach us?

Look at that bright star! so remote that the astronomer with his telescope cannot calculate its distance, and yet its brilliant beams of light strike upon the eye and convince the merest child of its existence. What a vivid flash that was, and how loud the thunder! See yonder oak riven to its centre,—what an irresistible force, and yet the chemist, with his most delicate balance, cannot perceive its weight. Here is a mass of iron, weighing a thousand pounds, moving rapidly upwards, notwithstanding the attraction of the earth to this amount, without any visible link, towards another small bent piece of iron a foot long, encircled with the galvanic current;—and now falling heavily to the ground the instant that current is arrested. What a mysterious, albeit very visible effect from an invisible, impalpable, imponderable power, generated by such simple means. How warm the fire feels while we stand at the distance of some feet from the hearth! We can imagine how heat will go up the chimney, because heated air is lighter than cold air, and will therefore ascend; but how does the warmth get across horizontally to our legs! Oh, it is radiant heat or caloric, which travels in right lines in every direction. Very well; but what is radiant heat or caloric? What is light? What is electricity? What is magnetism? Several answers are given by philosophers to these questions. Taking light as the example, there are two modes of explaining it. According to NEWTON, light consists of *material particles* emitted by luminous bodies, and moving through space with a velocity of 192,000 miles in a second, and these particles striking the eye, produce the sensation of light. According to the other explanation of the phenomena, light consists in an undulating or vibratory movement, which, when it reaches the eye, excites the sensation of light in the same manner as the sensation of sound is excited in the ear by the vibrations of the air. It is obvious that this theory also presumes the existence of a *material medium*, through and by which the vibrations can be transmitted; in fact, it supposes that an exceedingly thin and elastic medium, called ether,

fills all space. For our present purpose it is unimportant which theory is regarded as the true one, inasmuch as both assume that *matter in some form* is concerned in producing the various impressions of light and color upon the living animal body. The effects are produced by imponderable but not by immaterial agents. To convey some faint notion of excessive minuteness, it may be mentioned that the length of an undulation of the extreme violet ray of light is 0.0000167 of an inch; the number of undulations in an inch is 59,750; and the number of undulations in, a second is 727,000,000,000,000 (727 billions); while the corresponding numbers for the indigo ray are—length, 0.0000185 of an inch; 54,070 undulations in an inch; and 658,000,000,000,000 (658 billions) in a second. The other rays differ in similar proportions. ‘That man,’ says HERSCHTEL, ‘should be able to measure with certainty such minute portions of space and time is not a little wonderful; for it may be observed, whatever theory of light we adopt, these periods and these spaces have a *real existence*, being in fact deduced by NEWTON from direct measurements, and involving nothing hypothetical, but the names which have been given them.’

“Whether therefore light be viewed as material particles emitted continuously, and in all directions, by luminous bodies, or as the vibrations of an elastic material medium, it is, in either case, dependent upon *matter* for its existence or production; it is matter, but exceedingly rare, subtle, and so minutely divided as to be to us absolutely imponderable.

“It is probable that heat, electricity, and magnetism are motions, varying in kind, of the same ether.

“That space is occupied by minute particles of matter admits of being proved in another manner, quite independent of these observations on light. It has been ascertained by astronomers that one of the comets, called *Encke's*, which is a body not denser than a small cloud of steam, for the stars are seen through it without any diminution of their brilliancy, and which revolves round the sun in 1208 days, has its period slightly diminished during each revolution. It is obvious that its motion is impeded by a *resisting medium*, by which its centrifugal force is diminished, and consequently the relative power of gravity is increased; this brings the comet nearer to the sun, its orbit becomes contracted, and the time occupied by a revolution shortened. Thus, by another series of observations, we arrive at the same conclusion that there exists a rare, subtle, and *imponderable form* of minutely-divided matter.

“Infinitesimal quantities of this imponderable matter are capable of acting energetically, and *they do so act* habitually, produc-

ing such impressions as those of light, etc., upon the living animal body.

“Reasoning, then, from analogy, we may conclude it to be *probable* that other forms of matter, even though reduced by the successive triturations into *similarly small dimensions*, may also act, and act powerfully, upon the living body.

“II. Are there any facts which show the action of infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter upon the *healthy* body?

“The beautiful adaptation of the different departments of nature to each other is justly adduced as a demonstration that the whole has been created and arranged under the guidance of Infinite Wisdom and Power. In nothing is this adaptation more conspicuous than in the appropriate fitness of the corporeal senses of man to the surrounding world.

“So far as we are cognizant of the material creation, it is disposed under the five following forms:—solid bodies, liquids, gases or airs, imponderable ether, and minutely divided particles of ponderable bodies. For the appreciation of these various forms of matter we have five senses. The sense of touch, mainly conversant with solid bodies; that of taste, which is impressed by liquids only; the delicate organ of hearing, which can perceive the vibratory movements of gases or airs; the still more delicate organ of the eye, capable of receiving impressions from the undulations of the imponderable ether; and, lastly, the sense of smell, adapted to the condition of the particles of bodies, when they have become so divided as to be infinitesimal, that is, indefinitely small and imponderable.

“It is this form of matter which we have now specially to consider. The particles separated from larger masses, which become by degrees so small as to elude in succession the perception of all our senses, and perhaps at length are reduced to a state similar to the ether.

“A cubic inch of platinum, the heaviest body we are acquainted with, weighs upwards of 5000 grains. A cubic inch of hydrogen, the lightest body which affects our balances, weighs 2 grains. These balances, by ingenious contrivances, are made very sensitive. I have one which readily weighs 0.005, or five-thousandths of a grain. Others have been constructed still more delicate; but the particles we are now examining are far too light for any balance to appreciate.

“Mechanical division can be carried to an almost incredible degree. Gold, in gilding, may be divided into particles at least one thousand four hundred millionths of a square inch in size, and yet possess the colour and all other characters of the largest mass. Linen yarn has been spun so that a distinctly visible portion could not have weighed the 127 millionth of a grain; and yet this, so

far from being an ultimate particle of matter, must have contained more than one vegetable fibre, that fibre itself being of complex organization, and built up of an indefinitely great number of more simple forms of matter.

"The perfection of modern chemistry is such that a quantity of silver, equal to the billionth of a cubic line, can be readily detected.

"That particles become divided into less portions than is here shown in these examples is evident from the daily observation of the sense of smell. The violet fills even a royal apartment with its sweet odor, which is thus readily perceived, but which absolutely eludes every other mode of observation. How inconceivably small must be the particles of all odors! And yet how obviously material they are.

"A grain of musk may be exposed for a long period, and be unceasingly emitting particles, easily appreciated by the sense of smell, yet has it not lost in weight what the most sensitive balance can detect.

"These are instances of infinitesimal quantities of matter acting upon the *healthy* body.

"Contagious malaria constitute a large class of agents whose power of injuriously acting upon our healthy body is so greatly dreaded, and no one has yet doubted that they are material. Who voluntarily crosses the Pontine Marshes at certain seasons of the year, or exposes himself to the plague of Constantinople, or the yellow fever of the West Indies? The microscope cannot show these terrible particles, nor can chemical analysis detect them. Ozone perhaps decomposes them.

"To come nearer home, a clergyman visits a patient in scarlet fever, but does not touch him, he afterwards calls upon a friend, and shakes the hand of one of the children as he passes her on the stair case. The next day this child sickens with the scarlet fever, and her brothers and sisters take it from her; no other connection can be traced. This is no uncommon occurrence, and no one doubts the communication of infection in such a manner, neither is it doubted that the infection itself is something material. What is the *weight* of the particle of matter thus conveyed? Is it heavier than the millionth of a grain of *Belladonna*, which, it is asserted by homœopaths, is sufficient, when given at short intervals, to arrest the progress of such a case?

"These, then, are also instances of infinitesimally small quantities of matter acting upon the living body in *health*.

"There are numerous liquids which have the power of affecting the healthy body, and some of them of taking away life, and yet in each instance the quantity of the active ingredient is so exceedingly small that hitherto no means have been effectual in detecting it.

"The vaccine matter has been so often mentioned that I will not allude to it further.

"Several animals are furnished with poisonous liquids, which, when injected into a wound, occasion the disease or death of the wounded animal. Serpents, bees, scorpions, and spiders are well-known examples. In the venomous serpents there is found an apparatus of poison-fangs, constituting perhaps the most terrible weapons of attack met with in the animal creation. The poison-teeth are two in number, placed in the upper jaw, when not in use they are laid flat upon the roof of the mouth; but when the animal is irritated, they are plucked up from their concealment, and stand out like two long lancets. Each fang is traversed by a canal, through which the poison flows. The gland which secretes the poison is composed of cells, communicating with a duct by which the venom is conveyed to the tooth. The poison-gland is covered by a muscle which is attached to a thin fibrous line. This is part of the muscle which closes the jaw, so that the same power which strikes the teeth into the viper's prey, compresses at the same moment the bag of poison, and forces it through the fangs into the wound.

"The quantity of poison contained in the gland scarcely exceeds a drop, but the smallest portion of this liquid taken upon the point of a needle, and inserted by a slight puncture into the skin of an animal, is sufficient to produce all its poisonous effects. From some serpents it produces almost immediate death. FONTANA first subjected it to chemical analysis, and sacrificed many hundred vipers in his experiments. Others have succeeded him in these labors, but nothing peculiar has been discovered. The poison is a yellow liquid, and has not been distinguished chemically from simple gum-water.

"Here are examples of infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter acting with frightful energy upon the *healthy* body.

"Medicinal substances furnish other proofs. I must content myself with a single example. Inappreciable quantities of *Ipecacuanha* give an affirmative answer to our present question so decisive and convincing, that I make no apology for extracting the following cases from that well-known and highly respectable allopathic periodical the *London Medical and Physical Journal*:—

"An apprentice of mine, naturally healthy, and of an active disposition, is invariably affected with a most distressing and protracted sneezing on the most careful dispensing of the smallest quantity of *Ipecacuanha*. A more continued application of it, such for instance as happens in the preparation of the compound powder, is followed with dyspnoea (difficulty of breathing), cough, and spitting of blood. Having oc-

casion some time ago to compound the medicine for several days together, he became seriously affected by it, in the way just stated, and he has not enjoyed full health since. It has evidently produced a disposition to asthma, and an aptitude for pulmonary ailment, which he had not used to possess.'

"In the year 1787 or 8, in pounding the root to make the *Ipecacuanha* wine, I was suddenly affected with violent and reiterated sneezings, with a very profuse defluxion from the eyes and nose; these symptoms continued without intermission for many hours, accompanied by great heat and anguish throughout the cavity of the thorax, and the most oppressive dyspnœa. Exhausted by the violence of the attack, I was conveyed to bed, where, supported, for I was unable to lie down, I remained more or less afflicted till the next morning. I arose extremely weakened, and with all the usual appearances of a severe catarrh. From this date I have been perpetually tormented by violent catarrhs. The slightest motion of the simple or compound powder of *Ipecacuanha* superinduces precisely similar, but more gentle effects. When weighing or mixing these powders afterwards, I carefully guarded my mouth and nose by a cloth; but an incautious removal of it for inspiration, till perhaps half an hour had elapsed, after the medicine was finished, occasioned the same inconveniences. At length I was compelled to quit the shop when *Ipecacuanha* was in hand; indeed, I have frequently entered my own, or the shop of a stranger, long after it had been used, and by the instant recurrence of these very distressing sensations have been able too accurately to ascertain the recent exposure of this drug.'

"I never designedly had recourse to *Ipecacuanha* for more than twenty years. Two accidents lately, within a few weeks of each other, afforded me the opportunity of determining its present effects when inwardly administered. A friend hearing me cough in the street, presented me with a few lozenges; I took two at once; they were scarcely dissolved, ere I felt a pungent roughness in every part of the mouth, exciting a great secretion of saliva; this, it is worthy of noting, was the reverse in the preceding attacks, when the excretory ducts uniformly denied their offices, and occasioned a disagreeable dryness of the mucous membrane. As this acrid sensation extended to the lips, they became prodigiously swollen and inflamed. On the fauces I experienced the like effects, with a most teasing itching irritation; it descended the trachea, producing pain and dyspnœa; it likewise proceeded down the œsophagus; creating a slight heat in the stomach, and passed with moderate gripings throughout the intestinal canal.'

"Soon after, a powder was brought to my house, with an order to prepare more of the same kind. I conveyed a few particles to my tongue to discover its composition; I quickly experienced those feelings in the mouth and lips which arose from the lozenges before, but in a milder degree, and they extended no further. Upon referring to the prescription, I found there was one grain of *Ipecacuanha* and ten of *Calcined Magnesia*. The incident gave birth to the idea that the former strange affection had originated from the same cause as the latter, and upon inquiry my suspicion was confirmed; they were *Ipecacuanha* lozenges which I had swallowed . . . Snuff and other stimulating powders excite no more irritation on me than on others.'

"One of the Editors recollects a somewhat similar effect produced on his father.'

"To these three cases (the two preceding, and one by Mr. Royston, alluded to in January 9, 1809), I shall now add two in females, who seem to have been affected in so similar a manner by the subtle effluvia of *Ipecacuanha*, that to enumerate their symptoms would be only to repeat what has already been given respecting those effects.

"The first of these cases is that of a lady, now about fifty, the wife of a surgeon, and mother of a numerous family. The general state of health has always been good, her disposition lively and active, and by no means possessing anything of that valedudinarian irritability which marks striking peculiarity of constitution. She has been much in the habit, when the hurry of business required it, of assisting her husband in dispensing medicines. This gave rise to her first discovery of the effects of *Ipecacuanha* on her habit. I had an opportunity of remarking this fact about eighteen months ago, being on a professional visit at her house, while her husband labored under a severe fever. She was about to dispense one of my prescriptions in which some *Ipecacuanha* had been ordered, and the moment she saw what the composition was, she ran to a distant part of the house, refusing to dispense it. This excited my curiosity to find the cause. On following her she explained it, and with some degree of anxiety looked round, lest some of the doors between her and the shop should have been left open while the prescription was about to be dispensed. As my stay was protracted some days, I had occasion to see these fears repeatedly excited. One forenoon in particular, while she was in her kitchen, a considerable distance from the shop (two passage-doors being between herself and it), while she could neither see nor know beforehand that *Ipecacuanha*, which was the case, was weighing, she called out with vehemence to have the doors closed, on account of the sensations she was beginning to feel.'

“The second instance came to my knowledge only the day before yesterday. The lady who is the subject of it called on me on her mother's account, who was indisposed, and being shown into my room, took up your last Journal, which lay on my table, to amuse herself till my appearance. On my entering the room she told me she had been reading my book, and the part which she accidentally opened was Mr. B.'s communication; she added, with a smile, “This is far from so uncommon a case as this gentleman seems to think, for I myself am afflicted by it in the same manner;” and then went into a considerable detail of the symptoms it excited in her. The catarrhal affection and sneezing she described as particularly distressing. The copious flow was so acrid as to excoriate, in a few hours, the parts over which it fell. Her upper lip and the alæ of the nostrils were swelled. But what created in her the most alarm was its effects on her eyes. They became swelled and stiff, and sight was diminished. The eyelids tumefied so much that the eyes were sunk almost out of sight, which seemed to be the chief cause of the diminution of vision; the discharge from her eyes was nearly as great as that from her nose, and little less acrid No catarrhal effects were excited in her by snuff.”

“I know a lady who was always seized with asthma whenever *Ipecacuanha* root was pounded in the shop; so sensible was she of this effect, that it was in vain to conceal from her what was going on in the mortar. This occurred about thirty years ago in the lady of the physician (Dr. Buckingham, of Wooler) to whom I was first a pupil, and I was twice the innocent cause of the complaint myself. I thought by her being in a remote part of the house she could not be affected; but it was almost immediately felt, and the paroxysm lasted many hours. This lady was exquisitely nervous.

“I have been informed of different cases almost similar; they were all women, but conceiving the observation a common one, I did not note them.”

“Two similar cases, the wives of medical men, are given in vol. xxiv. page 233, by Dr. Scott. One attack, caused by being near her husband at the time he put some *Ipecacuanha* into a bottle, was so violent as *nearly to prove fatal*. There was a remarkable stricture about the throat and chest, with a very troublesome shortness of breathing, with a particular kind of wheezing noise. The symptoms were aggravated at night. ‘At three o'clock in the morning she was gasping for breath at a window, pale as death, her pulse scarcely to be felt, and in the utmost immediate danger of suffocation. She became easier about eleven A. M., till about eleven, P. M. *The same scene was continued eight days and nights successively.*’

“Mr. Leighton, a very eminent surgeon at Newcastle, very nearly lost his wife in a similar manner.”

“Here, then, are undeniable proofs from odors, from contagious malaria, from animal poisons, and from medicinal substances, from which it may be strongly concluded that infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter do act with great and sometimes with destructive, energy upon the *healthy* body.

(To be continued.)

THE FORCE OF EVIDENCE ALONE LEADS TO FAITH IN HOMŒOPATHY.

The human mind hesitates to admit what is new or extraordinary. It is common for one person to charge another with credulity, but never suspects himself capable of it. The superficial or no-thinker sneeringly declares that the people are disposed to believe on slight evidence or no evidence at all. This is an error, the reverse being the case. We do not, by any means, intend to complain of the doubting tendency of the human mind, although it may run into an obstinate, unreasonable rejection of truths which are proved. Yet it is a protection against a too-ready reception of what is not established by competent evidence. The history of many valuable discoveries in science and art, which at the beginning were not only rejected for absurdities, but the discoverers and those who believed were personally ridiculed before the public, and also in private before the intelligent and learned, who were influenced by the common tendency of human minds to scepticism.

This subject, if better understood, would greatly facilitate the spread of truth, which, as is well known, has up-hill work in its progress. As it is our special duty to promulgate Homœopathy, pure Homœopathy, we would employ this doubting tendency to illustrate some things in the history of that system of medicine.

Long previously to the announcement by Hahnemann of his system, the confidence of the people in Allopathy began to diminish. And notwithstanding it was manifest that a safer and a more certain mode of treatment of diseases was demanded by the people, as well as by some of the more intelligent of

the profession, yet there was no sudden belief in Homœopathy, for those who embraced it observed great caution, and pursued an unusually thorough investigation of it, for nothing short of the fullest conviction of its truth, based upon sufficient evidence, arising out of demonstrations and clear definitions, would satisfy. Some persons, of little faith in Homœopathy, because of a very limited investigation, employ it in mild cases, but in more severe affections yield what little belief they have in it, and submit to measures which have been proved a thousand times to be uncertain and unsafe. The same remark applies to a class of physicians; while others have battled against Hahnemann's system step by step, have taken nothing for granted, but obstinately persisted in resisting every principle and rule of practice, until compelled to believe by the force of evidence.

This has worked well for Homœopathy, for never did a system undergo such critical and able examination. She courted the closest scrutiny, and does so yet. She demands faith in no one without the fullest proof. There are still those who refuse to investigate her claims; we regret to be compelled to admit that such there are, and such there will be so long as the profession is cursed with illiterate, indolent and selfish members.

It does not require talent, nor learning, nor much labor, to cry *humbug*. Nothing disgraces the profession more than the ridicule it throws upon doctrines, without examination, that may be announced by a member of it, which do not agree with what is commonly received. To such a degree has this been carried that the people cannot safely rely upon hardly anything which the profession puts forth. There has been so much unscientific writing; so much secret personal opposition; so much downright misrepresentation; so many cliquish measures for selfish purposes; so much private interest, and so little dignified and honorable deportment among medical men; so little charitable judgment of one another, that honesty, real honesty in thought and act, is so rarely developed, that there is no longer such a thing as credulity among the people, nor among physicians. Physicians doubt, and so do the people. Physicians

cry *humbug*, and so do the people. Many of the latter regard medicine as a useless and an expensive article, and many of the former virtually join them in that opinion. Allopathy says, "Homœopathy is a do-nothing system," but she cures more cases than Allopathy, as is now established. The just inference drawn by the people from such views, furnished by medical men is, that it is safest to permit diseases to take their course undisturbed by medication. Old School physicians begin to feel the effects of their folly in this respect, and have lately undertaken to regain their position by the admission that the "small doses" have power to influence the human organism. But this will not avail if they adhere to Allopathy. If the members of the profession could be induced calmly to investigate Homœopathy by the rules laid down by Hahnemann, but a short time would elapse before either, that system would beyond a doubt be proved false, or, on the contrary, proved to each one what those who have thus examined it declare, that it is the only scientific mode of treating human maladies. Is there anything in this unreasonable? We think not. Is it not the only course left for medical men to pursue to settle their differences? We know of none other.

The conduct of homœopaths generally, is praiseworthy in the highest degree. Homœopathy is popular, and is becoming more so daily. This has arisen, not from her theory, not from her principles as laid down in the books, for comparatively few have studied these, but alone from the cures which have taken place by her. Every true homœopathist of but a few years' practice knows, that this mode of treatment can effect cures of diseases; and in cases, too, in which it is notorious that allopathic practice uniformly fails. Now, with a knowledge of this fact, if homœopathists were a selfish and dishonest "tribe," as is often asserted by a vulgar medical print of this city, and responded to by nearly all the allopathic journals, they have an unusual way of showing their selfishness and their dishonesty. One would suppose that concealment would answer best for a dishonest purpose, for such is the common practice, especially among *quacks*. Concealment is,

we were about to write, an essential attribute of *quackery*. Homœopathists conceal nothing. They tell the world what they do, and the reason for it. Therefore we will, in the gentlest manner, suggest to our allopathic brethren that when they charge that homœopathists are quacks, and their system quackery, they handle an instrument of two edges, which may cut themselves; we have heard many people say that this has already happened, for they see a gaping wound, of an unhealthy look, which grows worse and worse, notwithstanding the vigilance, learning, and skill of the most eminent men in Allopathy.

Let us hear no more of the credulity of physicians and of people because they have faith in Homœopathy.

LECTURE ON HOMŒOPATHY.

By DR. G. C. HOLLAND.

On the evening of Monday, the 17th ult., a public lecture was delivered in the Council Hall of Sheffield by Dr. G. C. Holland, on the "Theory and Practice of Homœopathy, and an Exposition of the Principles explanatory of the Action of Homœopathic Remedies," to a numerous and respectable audience, who listened attentively, and frequently expressed their approbation of the sentiments of the lecturer in a marked manner. Alderman Henry E. Hoole occupied the chair.

"The lecture was illustrated by three illuminated diagrams—one representing the brain, the spinal cord, and the principal nerves connected with it; another the face and the main nerves; and the third, the stomach."

From the two leading local journals, the *Sheffield Times* and the *Sheffield Free Press*, we gather the following analysis of the learned lecturer's interesting discourse.

He commenced his lecture by combating the prejudices which every new theory or system had to encounter.

"The Bishop of Salzburg was burnt for hazarding the opinion that, as the earth was spherical, it was possible that there were inhabitants at our antipodes. Cromwell, the bold, the daring, the independent, lost his life from the prejudice of his physicians. He was attacked with the ague, and although Peruvian bark had been introduced a few years before, and was an antidote for it, yet the physicians of the day would not apply it.

"He stated that in 1848-9 he entered upon the investigation of the functions of the nervous system, and when he had proceeded in his physiological inquiry to the 300th page, he was startled at the conclusion to which his own principles led, viz., that according to these, small or minute doses of remedies ought to be capable of affecting the condition of the vital powers. He then, he remarked, knew nothing of Homœopathy, nor was he acquainted with a homœopath, either professional or lay. In order to test

the correctness of his principles, he began to try the efficiency of minute doses—a single drop of a well-known and not very active tincture, and afterwards half a drop, and the fourth of a drop—and was astonished to find that the remedies in these minute quantities invariably gave evidence of their efficiency. He then remarked that the whole of his doctrine in regard to the origin and nature of diseases rested on his investigations into the functions of the nervous system. This subject had occupied the attention of the medical mind from the time of Hippocrates to the present day. The early opinion was, that all diseases originated in the morbid or deteriorated condition of the blood. Within the last few centuries it had been contended that diseases were to be traced to an alteration in the condition of the solids of the body. His own view was that all diseases were originally to be referred to the disordered states of the nervous system. He proceeded to illustrate and prove the justness of his view by showing the mode in which the heart, the stomach, and the bowels were affected through the nervous system altogether, by mental, physical, and chemical causes, during life and after death. In support of his argument he related several of his own experiments. He then gave a general view of the nervous system, the brain, the cerebellum, the medulla oblongata, the spinal cord, the sympathetic nerve, the ganglia, and the plexuses, which are formed by the different nerves. He showed how nervous matter is distributed to the various organs of the body, which he stated was unquestionably the channel through which the animating power, the nervous fluid, principle or agent was transmitted to every molecule of living or organic substance. This part of the lecture was illustrated by the colored diagrams already alluded to, and we must say that Dr. Holland certainly succeeded in rendering a difficult scientific subject easy of comprehension to the ordinary non-professional understanding. He dwelt on this division of his lecture, as it was the foundation on which he based his views concerning the origin, nature, and treatment of disease. He next proceeded to explain the origin and nature of disease by analyzing the cause and nature of inflammation, and especially inflammation of the lungs and of the windpipe. He explained the manner in which the animal system is affected in the first stage of the disease and the subsequent stages, in the last of which the disease is frequently incurable. He pointed out the changes in the condition of the nervous system co-existing with these different stages, and stated that the alterations in the properties of the blood, and of all other fluids of the body, and in the character of the circulation, were decidedly effects which were to be traced to the primary and subsequent modifications in the vital condition of the nervous system. He asserted that it was this system alone which gave to all other parts of the body the power of performing their respective functions, whether these functions were the secretion of gastric juice, of bile, of the peculiar secretions of the bowels, of the skin, of the kidneys, and in fact every vital action that enters into the aggregate of the functions of life. He then explained in what manner homœopathic remedies act. The mode in which remedies influence the animal system has not, he stated, been clearly defined by writers. The prevalent opinion was, that they acted through the blood or the circulation. The lecturer contended they could act in one mode only, through the nervous system, and that all changes in the condition of disease were to be ascribed to the altered state of the nerves of the part or of the organ affected. If the remedies mixed with the blood they could still act only on nervous matter, and through this on disease. The larger arteries were simply carriers of the blood, and in them it produced no vital results. It must be transmitted to the capillaries, or the minute vessels, of which organs were principally formed—vessels so small that they could be seen only by the aid of the microscope. When the remedies, if they were carried along by the current of the blood, reached these minute vessels, they would in this situation modify the condition of nervous matter, and this again would alter the condition of other tissues, and in this manner disease would be influenced by the remedial agents employed. On this view the lecturer explained the mode in which homœopathic remedies act on the vital powers. Minute as the doses are, they are sufficiently powerful

to modify the condition of the nerves, and hence the fluids and tissues which enter into the composition of every organ of the body. He then brought forward remarkable instances which proved the great changes produced in the state of well-known metals and mineral waters, by the addition of substances perfectly homœopathic in quantities. These facts rested on the experiments of chemists and philosophers. He then argued that if such changes were produced in inorganic substances by the addition of minute quantities of other materials, surely it was reasonable to infer that minute doses of active remedial agents would influence the properties of life, which must possess an extraordinary degree of susceptibility. The lecturer explained what he understood by the homœopathic law, 'like cures like,' which, he observed, was very imperfectly understood by the opponents of Homœopathy. He argued the matter in the following manner. All remedies possessed peculiar properties, and no two remedies were alike in their composition and in their chemical qualities; consequently their action would be different. This necessarily followed from a difference in their properties. It therefore became the duty of the enlightened practitioner to ascertain the action of each of the remedies which he employed on the healthy and diseased states of the body. Hahnemann, the discoverer of Homœopathy, had done this. He was occupied many years in tracing the action of important remedies on the vital powers, and that some he found affected this organ particularly, that another organ, and so on. It was then he saw clearly that a remedy which most promptly cured any given disease, was one that affected the organ in which it was seated the most powerfully in health, when the remedy was administered in excess. Why should a remedy that acted chiefly on the bowels be given to cure an affection of the lungs? or why should a remedy that acted almost exclusively on the kidneys, the skin, or the lungs, be given to cure an affection of the liver? Remedies should be given that influenced directly the condition of the organ diseased, otherwise serious mischief would be done to organs that were comparatively healthy, which would aggravate the existing malady. The homœopath gives remedies which have a specific action on the organ for which they are prescribed—organs suffering from disease; and consequently he does not waste the potency of these remedies, by forcing them, from any admixture with other medicinal substances, to disorder the rest of the animal system; causing, in fact, far more disease than they remove. In many cases the remedy was much more to be dreaded than the disease for which it was prescribed, and it not unfrequently left behind effects from which the individual, whether young or old, never recovered."

As instances of the correctness of the theory of like producing like he gave the following illustrations.

"*Arsenic*, when given in excess, produced cancerous sores and yet it was the best curative for such sores. *Mercury* killed one-half of mankind. Nothing produced sore throats and fever sooner than *Mercury*; and yet *Mercury* was the sheet-anchor of the allopaths in these cases. *Tartar Emetic* was the best remedy for inflammation of the lungs; and yet Magendie, a celebrated French physician, had discovered that nothing induced congestion and inflammation of the lungs sooner than this remedy. *Nux Vomica*, which was an intense bitter—and greatly used by brewers, as a substitute for hops, on account of its cheapness—was an excellent remedy for spasms and the palsy; and yet it erected those complaints. He alluded to the case of a man who had been drinking a glass or two of beer in a public house, and was shortly after attacked with spasms. He (Dr. Holland) suspected that the beer had been adulterated, and went to test it himself, and it acted upon him as it did upon his informant. He was confident that this proceeded from the *Nux Vomica* used by the brewer. These were instances of like producing like."

The lecturer then proceeded to show,

"That the active remedies which the allopathic practitioner used were, unknown to himself, effecting

a cure (when they acted at all curatively and beneficially) according to the very law of Hahnemann, 'like cures like,' *similia similibus curantur*. He gave various illustrations of this fact, and asked why the allopath gave a remedy in disease of the lungs which he would not prescribe for disease of the liver or the kidneys, unless he knew from his experience that it would affect the lungs? He gives it because he believes it has a particular or specific action on the morbid condition of the lungs, and so on in the treatment of other diseased states of the body. The homœopath does this in every case, and from knowing (from the previous trials upon the healthy) the specific action of his remedies, it is not necessary to give large doses. Experience teaches him that minute quantities of his remedies, correctly prescribed, will effect the object in view. Some of the most valuable of the homœopathic remedies had been lately employed by the opponents of Homœopathy, without any acknowledgment whence the idea of trying them was derived, and that they were even given in homœopathic quantities, and according to the opponents themselves, with very great success, and were recommended by them to the medical profession at large."

Instancing Dr. Glover's recent application of *Phosphorus* in cases of consumption, which had long been one of the chief remedies of the homœopaths, Dr. Holland observed it was rather too bad to steal, and

"Abuse the very men who argued in favor of the employment of these remedies. He then stated that he was willing to meet any medical gentleman of Sheffield to discuss publicly the respective merits of the two systems, and he challenged any one of them to a public discussion, on condition that they would allow both systems to be fairly examined."

And he concluded by saying that

"If he had not succeeded in convincing any one of the efficacy of the system he advocated, yet he should be amply rewarded if he had only been the means of dispelling the unjust prejudices many entertained against the system, and if it induced them to inquire further into the subject."

The Chairman then inquired if any medical gentlemen present felt disposed to accept Dr. Holland's challenge; but no response being given, a vote of thanks to the Doctor for his very interesting lecture was duly moved, seconded, and carried by acclamation, as was also one to the Chairman, and the meeting separated.—*Hom. Times*.

THE OPPOSITION—ITS TENDENCY.

The great truths promulgated by Hahnemann are working their way into the minds of the profession and of the people. Allopathy, which is a sort of classic name for *quackery*, would be denounced everywhere, were it not that it is still advocated by men who have some reputation for learning and honesty. The people generally do not seem to be aware that a person may be learned and honest, but deluded, and zealously advocate doctrines prejudicial to the happiness of the human family. Nevertheless such is the fact, and especially so is it in medicine. It is also true that many intelligent people

understand the doctrines promulgated by Hahnemann, while few physicians, comparatively, have an accurate perception of them.

The following extract shows that even when a principle is accurately defined, the writer does not know how to trace it; nor does he know in what conditions to apply it; nor does he recognise it out of the words which express or define it. Several things in the extract from the *Medical Times and Gazette* have been contradicted again and again, and our readers would consider it an unnecessary work for us at this time to show that many of the statements have no more analogy to the subject propounded than the system of pure *quackery*, Allopathy, has to Homœopathy. We therefore leave Mr. Headland's remarks with all their force against Hahnemann's doctrines; for it is a fact, that when an antagonist deals unfairly, or mistakes points at issue, or reasons falsely when the points are properly stated, or mixes his opposition with falsehoods, tends to aid the progress of the very thing to which such a course is designed to oppose and demolish. It is not unlikely that the advocates of that pernicious system of quackery—Allopathy—have done more by their misrepresentations of Homœopathy, and by decrying the character of her practitioners, to induce an inquiry by competent and unprejudiced persons to fairly and fully investigate her claims, than even her success in the cure of diseases. Having for years noted the course of the opposition, and endeavored to judge of its influence, we are prepared to say, that if we thought it best to publish any more controversial papers, we could not do better than to reproduce in our columns the articles of our opponents without note or comment.

"HOMŒOPATHIC DELUSION."

Mr. Headland, in his recent work on the action of medicines on the system, thus notices this transcendental humbug:—

"The rule of the disciples of Hahnemann is, *Similia similibus curantur*; or, diseases are to be cured by remedies which shall produce effects similar to them. Now, if this were the case, the majority of disorders would be hopelessly incurable. We know of no medicines that are capable of producing such affections as ague, small-pox, or phthisis: and when such remedies are

known, their employment would certainly be singularly objectionable. Who would administer strychnia in tetanus, opium in congestion of the brain, or irritants in gastrodynia? The arguments alleged in support of the theory are of the most fallacious kind. For example, it is said that diaphoretics cured the sweating sickness, and purgatives are given with advantage in diarrhœa, on the homœopathic principle. But it should be observed that the sweating in one case, and diarrhœa in the other, are the attempts of Nature to get rid of the disease by eliminating a poison; and that, in seconding these attempts, we are availing ourselves of an agency which does not resemble the disease, but is like to the natural mode of cure. Such treatment depends, in fact, upon the principle which will have to be considered next in order. The homœopathists would work a strange revolution in the *Materia Medica*. Charcoal, silica, and other substances supposed to be inert, appear as remedies of wonderful efficacy. It is said that belladonna produces a state like scarlatina, and also a condition resembling hydrophobia, and thus cures both of these disorders. Of these three propositions, it is almost needless to say that all are equally erroneous. Further, an experimental trial of this principle was made by Andral on a large number of patients at the Académie in Paris, with the assistance of the homœopathists themselves. The medicines were carefully and fairly administered, but in no one instance were they successful."—*Medical Times and Gazette*, Nov. 20, 1852.

THE HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

We had the pleasure of being present at the commencement of the above named college on the 1st inst. Our readers probably know that the institution under notice was chartered by the Legislature of Pennsylvania about five years ago, and that it is located in the city of Philadelphia. This college has authority by law to confer the ordinary degree of *doctor in medicine* like other colleges, and requires the same qualifications to entitle a candidate to that degree; but in addition, by virtue of a special act of the Legislature of that State, it confers the degree of doctor of homœopathic medicine.

The number of students has gradually increased from year to year in a ratio encouraging to the trustees and to the faculty. One hundred and three matriculated at the session just closed, of which number fifty-

five graduated. It is but just for us to say that we never saw a class of graduates, to appearance, more intelligent. They come from different parts of our country, and we do not doubt their influence will aid very much the progress of Homœopathy. We rejoice in being able to state further that pure Homœopathy is taught in this college, and that a mixed practice receives no countenance from any member of the faculty.

We visited every part of the college building, and were pleased with its arrangement. The museum is already respectable, and is gradually being enlarged.

Professor Semple delivered an interesting address to the graduates, which caused frequent bursts of applause from a large audience of ladies and gentlemen. We have not room for extended remarks at this time; suffice it to say, in conclusion, that the Homœopathic College of Pennsylvania is now established on a firm basis, and its success and usefulness is no longer doubtful.

The names of the graduates, together with their places of residence and the subjects of their theses, are as follows:—

Henry C. Angell, Rhode Island, Office of the Colon; Alexander G. Austin, New-York, Preparation and Practice of Medicine; Franklin Bigelow, New York, Cimicifuga Racemosa; James D. Blake, England, —; James M. Blakesly, New York, Vis Vitalis; E. L. Boyle, New York, the Law of Cure; Joseph R. Brown, M.D., Texas, —; Titus L. Brown, New York, Allopathic and Homœopathic Obstetrics; H. T. Brownell, Connecticut, —; M. L. Casselberry, Pennsylvania, Paronychia; C. R. Chamberlain, M.D., Pennsylvania, Neuralgia; Ira E. Chase, M.D., Massachusetts, Medical Opinions and Qualifications; Peleg Clarke, M.D., Rhode Island, —; G. B. L. Clay, Pennsylvania, Mechanism of Parturition; John F. Cooper, Pennsylvania, Measles; David Cowley, Pennsylvania, Ephelides; J. P. Dinsmore, Rhode Island, Homœopathy and its Founder; Andrew Eustace, Pennsylvania, Hygiene; Eli D. Gibson, Ohio, Progressive Medicine; Charles R. Gorgas, Ohio, Dysentery; John Greenbank, Pennsylvania, Similia Similibus Curantur; Rollin R. Gregg, New York, Temperaments; B. B. Gumpert, Pennsylvania, Phosphorus; Thomas J. Hardy, M.D., Virginia, the Eye; John L. Harris, Massachusetts, Homœopathy a Natural System of Cure; L. B. Hawley, New York, Digestion; W. T. Helmuth, Pennsylvania, Apocynum Cannabis; Alfred Hughes, Virginia, Consuetudo Medicæ; G. W. Ingham, Pennsylvania, Pneumonia;

Edward R. Johnston, Pennsylvania, the Secretary System; Stacy Jones, Pennsylvania, Old and New School of Medicine; Alexander C. Miller, New Jersey, Cynanche Tonsillaris; Henry Minton, New York, Trillium Cernuum; Francis R. Moore, Pennsylvania, Examination of the Patient and Diagnosis; Asa W. Morse, New York, the Science of Medicine; John F. Musgrave, Pennsylvania, Hydrocephalus Acutus; Frederick N. Palmer, Maine, the Office of the Peritoneum; Theodore L. Pratt, Pennsylvania, Chimaphila Umbellata; Coates Preston, Pennsylvania, Homœopathy and Allopathy; Edward Reading, Pennsylvania, Lilium Superbum; Stephen Remington, Jr., New York, High Potencies; O. O. Roberts, Vermont, Hypertrophy of the Heart; W. Jackson Simons, New Jersey, Woman and her Diseases; G. E. E. Sparhawk, Vermont, Cobaltum; Joshua B. Stretch, Pennsylvania, Intermittent Fever; I. Tisdale Talbot, Massachusetts, Angina Membranacea; R. Tisworth, New York, Physiology of the Heart; John Turner, Michigan, Inflammation; Thomas Vernon, Rhode Island, Insanity and its Treatment; Charles H. Walker, New Hampshire, Dysentery; John A. Wakeman, M.D., Ohio, —; Seymour West, New York, Cause and Effect; Thomas C. Williams, Pennsylvania, Accuracy in Practice; J. J. G. Wilkinson, England, —; Ross M. Wilkinson, Pennsylvania, Inflammation.

WHOM THE GODS DESTROY, THEY FIRST MAKE MAD.

We do not perceive the necessity nor the good sense for those institutions of quackery, the allopathic medical societies, to adopt formal resolutions, as has been done, forbidding their members to consult with, or to hold social intercourse with, or to belong to the same church with those who practise Homœopathy. No true homœopath can desire a consultation with an empiric, however elevated he may be in his own eyes, or in those of his dupes. As regards social intercourse, self-respect, as well as the divine law, forbids communion with backbiters, evil speakers, and liars. And, also, it is a fixed principle which none but fools doubt, "evil communications corrupt good manners." And on this ground we advise all students who seek a true scientific and philosophical medical system, to avoid those quack manufactories—allopathic colleges. They are the last lurking places for error and professional corruption.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The agitation of thought is the beginning of Truth.

VOL. 7.

NEW-YORK, APRIL, 1853.

NO. 12.

S. R. KIRBY, M.D., EDITOR.

THE SMALL DOSE OF HOMŒOPATHY.

BY WILLIAM SHARP, F.R.S., LONDON.

(Continued from page 163.)

"III. What are the actual proofs in support of the assertion that such minute quantities of ponderable matter act remedially on the *diseased* body?

"The reply to the first question proposed renders it *probable* that infinitesimal quantities of ponderable matter *may* act upon the living animal body.

"The answer to the second question embraces very numerous and undeniable facts, which prove, in the most positive and unexceptionable manner, that such small quantities do produce direct and sometimes frightfully-powerful effects upon the living body in *health*.

"That similarly minute quantities will act upon the *unhealthy* body is thus shown to be in the highest degree probable, if not certain; for it may be argued, *a fortiori*, if they can act upon the body in health, much more will they be able to act when the nervous system is in a state of exalted sensibility, produced by the morbid excitement of disease. Any portion of the surface of the body may be rubbed violently, when in a healthy condition, without painful sensation; but the same part, when inflamed, will shrink from the slightest touch.

"It now therefore only remains that, by the evidence of facts, I prove, generally, that they do act, and particularly that their action is beneficial and remedial in disease.

"If any one were to ask a physician who has been for a few years in the daily habit of prescribing these small doses, *Do they act beneficially?* he would see an expression of countenance very like that which another person would exhibit if, while standing before a good fire, he were gravely asked if he felt any warmth. On the other hand, if a physician who has not been willing to try the doses, nor see them tried by others, be asked, *Can they act upon disease?* he assumes a tone like that of the king of Siam, when told by some European travellers that water sometimes becomes solid.

"I do not address those who have tried

the doses—they need no further evidence; nor those who will try them, and who, with wonderful presumption, declare that such doses *cannot* act—they may be quietly passed by; but those whose minds are open to conviction, and who think the care of their health and the prolongation of their lives an affair of sufficient moment to require them to give attention to any information on the subject openly and candidly set before them.

"The evidence which proves the beneficial action of the small dose is the same in kind as that which proves any other natural fact,—it is the evidence of observation and experiment, that which our senses afford us. It is of the same nature as the evidence we have of the relation of cause and effect in any events which happen around us. It does not differ from that which we have of the operation of the *large* doses of medicine.

"A patient has a violent headache; twelve leeches are applied to his temples: relief follows the application of the leeches. Had this happened but once, we ought to conclude that the fact of the removal of the pain following the application of the leeches was merely a coincidence, not an instance of cause and effect; but it has happened a hundred times, and we therefore conclude that the relief was the *effect* of the loss of blood by the leeches. Another patient has a similarly violent headache; the millionth or the billionth of a drop of the juice of the Deadly Nightshade is given: relief quickly follows. Had this happened but once, we ought to set it down as a coincidence—an accidental meeting of two events having no connection with each other—but it has happened a hundred times; shall it not then be concluded that the removal of the pain was the *effect* of the administration of the dose? Let any one who doubts such a conclusion, and who would attribute such frequent recurrences of the same succession of events to chance, take up a kaleidoscope and turn it round till he gets the same figure a second time. We need not wish him a severer punishment.

"I now offer the following statement of facts, for the truth of which I hold myself responsible.

"I am aware of 'the difficulty of tracing effects to their true causes,' and also that there are 'various sources of error in conducting medical inquiries.' It is due to truth to observe that I have used every endeavor to overcome the one and to avoid the other. I cannot hope to have succeeded in doing this in every case, but that the ultimate conclusion is a safe and a true one I can entertain no doubt.

"ACUTE DISEASE.

"It will not be expected that, in a pamphlet like the present, I should give minute details of disease. Were it the fitting opportunity, I could relate the particulars of the following cases.

"INFLAMMATION OF THE EYE.—Mr. Brodribb, in his 'Homœopathy Unveiled,' observes that, 'from the peculiar structure of the eye, we may often actually witness what is going on in diseases of that organ . . . With the same fidelity we can observe the effects of efficient treatment in the arrest and removal of the disease, and that, too, with such unerring certainty, as to leave no doubt in our mind of the relation of the two as cause and effect.'

"I have formerly often treated diseases of the eye by what Mr. Brodribb would acknowledge to have been 'efficient treatment,' and have often carefully watched its results. I have now also, a considerable number of cases, treated them with the small doses of homœopathy, and the beneficial results have been such 'as to leave no doubt in my mind of the relation of the two, as cause and effect.' One case was cured in a few days by the third dilutions of *Arnica*, *Aconite*, and *Belladonna*, where an allopathic physician had considered leeches to be indispensable. Other inflammatory affections of the eye have recovered much more rapidly and satisfactorily than I ever saw them do under any other treatment.

"INFLAMMATION OF THE THROAT.—The remark made by Mr. Brodribb with respect to the visibility of diseases of the eye applies also to those of the throat. I have very repeatedly seen the influence of minute doses of *Belladonna*, *Mercury*, *Hepar sulphuris*, and other remedies, upon the various stages of inflammation of the throat manifested in the most unmistakable manner. The Rev. — has had attacks of ulcerated sore throat repeatedly; under the usual treatment of blisters, etc., he has been laid up for some weeks on each occasion. I attended him lately for a similar attack. There was a large ulcer on each tonsil; he could scarcely swallow or speak; he was very feverish, and for two nights he had been deprived of sleep. Without discontinuing his usual duties, which are very laborious, for a single hour, and without any local application of any kind, he was perfectly cured in six days. In other cases,

where I thought suppuration and puncture of the tonsils inevitable, all the mischief dispersed, and recovery was effected in a few days.

"CROUP.—I have stated, in Tract No. 3, that several cases of croup have been treated after the new method. I have only to add here that the medicines were given in infinitesimal doses, and to assure my readers that the relief afforded, without any other treatment, not even a warm bath or a mustard poultice, was, in every instance, most obvious, rapid, and complete.

"INFLAMMATION OF THE CHEST.—Several cases of bronchitis and some of pneumonia have come under my care during the last three years. They have had no means whatever used to relieve them but the small doses. They have recovered more quickly and satisfactorily, and the attacks have been followed with a much shorter period of convalescence than I ever before witnessed, and the cure has been, so far, permanent.

"ERYSIPELAS.—This is always a serious and often a fatal complaint; it affords a good example of the confusion and inconsistency of allopathic medicine. 'The practice,' says Mr. Nunneley, who has written an excellent treatise on Erysipelas, 'pursued by different persons, is of the most dissimilar and contradictory nature; while one party relies upon blood-letting, freely and repeatedly performed, as the surest and only method of cure, another and perhaps larger party, certainly as respectable, so far as authority goes, utterly repudiates the abstraction of blood, and depends upon tonics and cordials for the removal of the complaint. Indeed, so confidently are the most opposite remedies enforced, and so contradictory are the results said to follow the application of the same means, in the hands of different persons, equally worthy of credit, that the impugnor of medical skill may fairly point with confidence to this part of our field, and demand if such contradictions are worthy of the name of a science or of trust.'

"It is not so with the homœopathic treatment of erysipelas. With minute doses of *Belladonna*, *Rhus*, and *Lachesis*, the usual remedies for this peculiar inflammation, I have succeeded in all the cases I have met with—among them were four severe ones—beyond my expectations. In the last case, which occurred to me this month, on the second day of the attack the inflammation had spread over the face, ears, most of the scalp, and part of the neck, with large blisters on each cheek, very severe headache, and a pulse of 150; this was entirely well at the end of a week.

"RHEUMATISM.—Some cases of rheumatic fever have afforded me excellent opportunities of seeing how beautifully the small doses relieve and frequently quickly cure this otherwise intractable complaint—one

of the *opprobria medicorum*. One case, a widow lady of 72, who had it then for the first time, and while in a state of considerable debility, was nearly well in a fortnight. Another, a farmer with organic disease of the heart, left by a former attack, a most severe case, with violent spasms of the heart threatening to terminate life, recovered in three weeks.

'CHOLERA AND DIARRHŒA.—The numerous statements published in various countries of the great efficacy of homœopathic treatment in cholera and diarrhœa have been confirmed by my own experience, so far as that has gone. In these cases I have always used the small doses, except when I was anxious to test the *principle* of homœopathy by giving ponderable quantities of the medicine indicated.

'YELLOW FEVER.—The ravages which this dreadful complaint is now making in Jamaica and other islands of the West Indies are painfully calamitous; of course, I have not myself treated this terrible malady, but from a trial of homœopathy, which has just been made in Barbadoes by Dr. Goding, it appears that, even after the black vomit has taken place, hitherto considered so fatal a symptom, homœopathy can still, with the blessing of God, rescue a victim from the grave. This ought to attract the attention of Governments. My information is from the *West Indian*, of October 28th, a Barbadoes paper, which has been kindly sent me.

"These must suffice as a *specimen* of the results in the treatment of acute diseases with minute doses of medicine only. To my own mind the efficacy of the method is most palpable and satisfactory. I have not one-fourth of the apprehension of an unfavorable termination in any acute attack of disease which I had in former times. The duration of the illness is much shortened, the danger greatly lessened, the strength of the patient husbanded, and convalescence, often so tedious and distressing, is almost annihilated.

"CHRONIC DISEASE.

"PAIN IN THE ELBOW.—Mr. R., a shopkeeper, consulted me in August, 1850, on account of a very distressing pain in the elbow, from which he had been suffering for twelve months. He had been under surgical treatment, I believe, the whole of that time. The joint was stiff and swollen, but did not appear to me to be seriously diseased: the pain, however, was described as being at times excruciating. I gave him a single dose of *Staphysagria*, highly diluted. In a few days I called to inquire after him, when he told me that the night he took my dose he was very strangely affected; he could scarcely describe how, but it was so powerful that he would not take any more of my medicine. 'How is your elbow?' 'Look!' he cried, and moving his arm in

all directions in a rapid manner, declared that it was well; and so it remained.

"DIABETES MELLITUS.—On the 7th of March, 1850, I was consulted by Mrs. —, a widow of about 47, who had been suffering for several years from various ailments, and had been during much of that time under the care of a physician. I found that one of her complaints was diabetes mellitus, which had been increasing upon her for the last two years. The quantity of urine in the twenty-four hours was fifteen pints, and the weight of sugar contained in this exceeded a pound. It would be tedious to report the daily progress of this case; it must suffice to say that, under the influence of minute doses of *Aconite*, *Sulphur*, *Nux vomica*, *China*, *Belladonna*, and some other remedies, by the middle of July she was so much recovered that the quantity of water was reduced to below three pints, that is, to the quantity natural in health; and though the presence of sugar could still be detected, it was comparatively small in quantity. She then went to the sea-side for two or three weeks. During her stay there, her son wrote to me that his 'mother was so well that she did not appear to ail anything.' She has since suffered in various ways from mental causes, and has had some return of the diabetes, but it has again yielded to the same remedies. It may be said of this case that the tendency to the complaint is not removed. This is granted; but while the causes which first induced the complaint are, in all probability, still surrounding the patient, it is not surprising if they succeed in bringing on second or third attacks. I have seen several cases of sugared urine formerly, but I never saw the old remedies afford such permanent benefit. Neither is it reasonable to expect that the new method will always succeed in such an intractable and hitherto usually fatal disease.

"December 28th, 1852. I called to see this patient to-day, when she told me she had not felt so well for many years as she did at present. It is now nearly three years since I first saw her in the alarming condition I have described.

"TABES MESENTERICA.—In September, 1852, Mrs. H— consulted me about her baby, eight months old, suffering from mesenteric disease. The little infant was greatly emaciated, and its mother expected that it was going to die. Excessively minute doses of *Sulphur* and *Chalk* were followed by a wonderful improvement in a fortnight; the medicines were repeated, and at the end of six weeks the child seemed nearly well—its stomach almost reduced to its natural dimensions, and its limbs filling up. Mrs. H— had been at first quite incredulous, and came to me only through the persuasion of a friend; she was now so much gratified, that she thought it her duty to call upon her former medical advisers, to

show them the child, and to offer a copy of one of my pamphlets. An angry scene ensued, and the following conversation took place:—‘I refuse to take the book; if Mr. Sharp said he was doing nothing we could respect him, but as it is we cannot.’ Mrs. H.: ‘But, sir, my child is cured!’ ‘Yes, it has got well by letting medicine alone.’ ‘But I tried what letting medicine alone would do for some time, and the child grew worse and worse. It began to improve from the very day Mr. Sharp’s medicine was commenced; and how was it that two other little babies of mine died of the same disease in your hands? If medicines do harm, and you knew that doing nothing would cure, why did not you recommend that plan?’

“DISEASE OF THE LUNGS.—Mr. W. S.—, aged 20, had a severe attack of inflammation in the chest during last winter, and was attended by two or three medical men. This was followed by chronic disease during the spring and summer. His friends despaired of his recovery. When I saw him in September he was emaciated; had cough and expectoration; his pulse 120; occasional flushings in the face; no appetite; the whole of the right lung returned a dull sound on percussion, and there was a peculiar sound of the voice through the stethoscope.

“I made no alteration in his diet or habits, and gave him nothing but infinitesimal doses of the medicines employed, such as *Aconite*, *Bryonia*, *Phosphorus*, etc.; these have been continued three months. He declares that he feels quite well; he looks well; he has gained flesh; he takes horse exercise, notwithstanding the wet; he has not the slightest cough nor expectoration; no fever; no perspiration; and the only symptom which remains to testify the reality of his former danger is revealed by the stethoscope; the unnatural sound of the voice, though much diminished, has not yet ceased.

“WARTS.—In two cases I have succeeded in clearing the hand of ugly warts. In both by internal treatment alone, and with infinitesimal doses of the medicines employed.

“PARTIAL PARALYSIS.—Mrs. M.— consulted me, three months ago, for paralysis of the thumb of the right hand, which had existed for some time. She had entirely lost the use of it; for instance, she could not take up a needle or hold it; she was otherwise ailing. The case reminded me of the condition of persons exposed to the poisonous influence of lead, as painters are. I prescribed the billionth of a grain of lead, in occasional doses for a month, and nothing else. At the expiration of the month, her husband, a respectable farmer, called to say that she was rather better, and wished for more medicine; it was repeated for a second month, and afterwards for a

third, on hearing still better accounts of her. A few days ago I was in the neighborhood, and called unexpectedly to see her. I found her sitting at her fireside busily engaged in *sewing*, and looking so much better that I scarcely recognized her. She spoke very gratefully of her improved condition.

“I am not now replying to opponents, but I cannot avoid making a quotation here from Mr. Brodribb: ‘Lead will give rise to all the symptoms of colic, and produce a certain form of paralysis, but it will not cure either of those affections.’ How does Mr. Brodribb know this? Has he ever tried it in these diseases in *any* dose? And if not, how can he make such an assertion?

“HABITUAL CONSTIPATION.—It is a great bugbear with many, especially with many amiable amateur practitioners of the healing art, that homœopathy dispenses with the old-fashioned doses of Gregory and black draught; that it professes to be able to go on its way prosperously without the aid of calomel and colocynth, senna, salts, and jalap.

“I acknowledge that at first I found this difficult to accomplish, but it is a difficulty surmounted. I now never think of having recourse to these remedies in the treatment of those cases in which they have usually been considered indispensable. If they are not necessary, they must be injurious. If they can be safely laid aside, the patient must be the gainer.

“But more than this. In a large number of cases of habitual constipation, I have succeeded quite beyond my own expectations in entirely removing this disagreeable condition. Some had taken aperients so long, and in such increasing quantities, that matters had come to an extremity. One lady had taken them ten or twelve years; another told me she had never gone to bed without her pills for between forty and fifty years; and another, that a pint of senna, etc., had become ineffectual; and yet an entire emancipation from this thralldom has been effected by the infinitesimal doses of the appropriate medicine. The nauseous physic was laid aside at once and, I believe, for ever. I have the pleasure of knowing one lady who did this at 70, and she is now enjoying comfortable health at 82.

“Such is a brief sketch of the results of the treatment of chronic disease.

“This is the case of the small dose, and the kind of evidence upon which it rests. I think it well to mention that the dilution of the medicines I have most frequently used is the 3d—in which the grain or the drop is divided into a million of parts. I have often used the 2d (the 10,000th part), and sometimes the 1st (the 100th part of a grain). I have also often used the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 12th; and I have seen beneficial effects follow the administration of the 18th and the 30th. Further than this I have not

gone, and I do not hold myself committed to anything beyond my own observation and experience.

"We are indebted to Hahnemann for the invention of this method of preparing and administering the remedy, as we are for the discovery of the rule by which we are to be guided in its choice.

"The difficulty of the case, I have said, lies in its incredibility. I trust this is now greatly lessened, if not removed. It is no other than that which attaches to every new statement—its *novelty*. It is the same difficulty as that which fastened itself upon the mind of the king of Siam. It vanishes before evidence. *It is credible* that the small dose can effect 'a safe, speedy, and permanent cure' whenever a cure is possible, *when it is found practically to do so*.

"To those who contend that, after so many triturations and dilutions, there can be nothing left in the dose, I beg to put two questions: first, seeing that a grain of the medicinal substance is added to ninety-nine grains of sugar in the first trituration, in which particular dilution has it ceased to exist? And, secondly, if the doses contain nothing, or are 'nihilities,' as Mr. Brodribb calls them, how do effects such as those referred to in this pamphlet follow the administration?

"To those who attempt to quash such statements as I have made by accusations of fraud or of falsehood, I have nothing to say. There is no common ground upon which we can meet to argue.

"To conclude, one obvious fact cannot be overlooked; all who bear testimony to the efficacy of these doses have tried them, either upon themselves or upon others; while those who deny their action not only have not tested it, but, for the most part, boast that they have not; reject the proposal to try the remedies with disdain, and continue to stigmatise those who do as 'knaves or fools,' or 'morally-attenuated dwarfs.'

"*Right reason being our guide, with which of these two parties is truth most likely to be found?*

"Rugby, Dec. 31, 1852."

THE PEOPLE MUST AID IN THE MEDICAL REFORM.

In the first number of this Journal, issued nearly seven years ago, we took the ground that a reform in medicine, such as Homœopathy is designed to accomplish, could not be successfully carried on unless the people were instructed on the subjects of diseases and their treatment. We are still of the same opinion, in truth, we perceive more clearly the necessity of such a course, not for the

purpose of making every one his own doctor, but our object is to enable the people to judge by authentic statistical reports the superiority of Homœopathy over allopathy, and also to enable them, by suitable intelligence, to select a properly-qualified practitioner; and when the choice, after due deliberation, is made, to leave the sick entirely under his management.

In this way, and in these respects, a reform in medicine has been gradually progressing; yet there is much remains to be done, and it is desirable that every member of the profession should feel that his own interest, and the general good are concerned in this matter.

The ignorance of the people in medicine renders the practitioner's life a drudgery, instead of its being what it ought to be, one of the most pleasant and desirable of all professions. The interference of ignorant persons with the physician's duties unfits him, in a measure, for a proper performance of his professional functions. "Doctor, *Tom* is no better," said a well-meaning mother; "I really think he is worse; and I don't believe anything you have done for him has done him any good. Doctor, you must, I insist upon it, do something more efficient. My husband and myself have been talking the matter over, and we have agreed that unless you consent to give him medicine that will act on him more powerfully, we must get a physician that will do so; for we cannot stand by and see him suffer any longer. *Tom* has now been sick three days, and at this moment he is worse than he was the first day, and only think of it, Doctor, he has not had a motion of his bowels for two days, and if you had not come in as you did, I would have given him a dose of magnesia or castor oil, or something of that sort, for it stands to reason, Doctor, that he should have an evacuation from his bowels; and further, Doctor, unless you exert yourself and make *Tom* better by to-morrow, I know my husband will dismiss you, and send for Doctor Quickeure, who has been highly recommended to us by Mrs. John Mischiefmaker, who called last evening, and she agreed with me that something must be done, or poor *Tom* can't stay with us much longer."

This is an example of what physicians

daily meet in their visits to the sick among all classes, high and low, rich and poor, all of which is based upon gross ignorance. Such scenes would never occur if the people were properly instructed in diseases and their treatment.

Thousands of lives are sacrificed annually by the dishonest, dishonorable, and hypocritical doings of those in and about the sick, whose limited knowledge makes them proud, self-willed, conceited, dissatisfied, and ready to embrace any new suggestion from whatever source it may come.

So general and deep-rooted among the people, is ignorance and superstition in medicine, that medical men feel compelled, for the safety of the sick, to resort to duplicity, to have their advice followed; and it would seem in such cases, that duplicity becomes a virtue. We do not advocate this doctrine, however, but merely state facts, for the edification of our lay readers.

An active man of business entered a physician's office early one morning, and said, "Doctor, I am quite out of sorts this morning, I wish you could give me something to relieve me." The Doctor thoroughly investigated the case, and said, "My dear sir, I fear you will have typhus fever; you should go home, and to bed, for you will probably be sick several days and perhaps weeks." "Nonsense, Doctor, give me something to break it up at once, to check it in the bud. Something strong, Doctor; none of your small doses." "I cannot do that," said the Doctor, "If I should do as you request, I might cause your death." "Pshaw! Doctor, there is my neighbor, Mr. Goahead, he was attacked with fever the other night, and his physician gave him a powerful dose, broke his fever at a stroke, and he was out next morning. Now, I want *you* to do that for me, or I must go to his physician." "But, sir," said the Doctor, "you do not understand this subject, you do not perceive that your friend had a fever of one kind and you have another, and the means used in the one with success, might kill the other." "Nonsense again, Doctor, fever is fever, and what cured one man should cure another. At all events I prefer those measures which are efficient. I want, when I take medicine, to feel it; so good morning,

Doctor, I must decline your services, you are not efficient enough for me."

Here we have an honest and skilful physician who undertakes to manage an ignorant and conceited patient, by frankly stating the truth, but he failed. The man employed one of the *heroic* practitioners who told him he could break up his fever in a "little less than no time," but in less than a week his patient was laid in a vault in the Greenwood Cemetery, and his family declared "that everything had been done for him but without avail. The doctor was with him day and night, administered the most powerful medicines, which *operated* freely. He was blistered, he was bled several times for his head, he was purged also; and brandy, clear brandy, in quantities enough to have made twenty men drunk, was given him; but nothing would do; it was evidently the will of God he should die, and we are in duty bound to submit to the wise dispensations of his providence." This is no fancy sketch, every physician who understands his profession knows it is not. It is an every-day occurrence; but it is owing entirely to the want of suitable knowledge of diseases and their treatment by the people, which Homœopaths are in duty bound to give them. Allopathists will never do it. It has been their purpose, and it is so yet, to conceal these things from the people, for quackery lives only in ignorance. Let Homœopaths undertake this work boldly and zealously. Circulate among the people proper periodicals, of which we have several, and in all ways which good sense dictates, help forward the great reform in the healing art which was begun so successfully by the illustrious Hahnemann.

THREE PRECAUTIONARY RULES OF HAHNEMANN.

By Dr. V. BENNINGHAUSEN.

THE author of homœopathy, in his work "The Chronic Diseases," has established three precautionary rules, which he has impressed in the most urgent manner upon the minds of his disciples, and which no homœopathic physician can violate without committing the greatest faults in practice.

They are the following:—

1. "To suppose that the doses which I have recommended for every antipsoric remedy, and which experience has taught me to be the proper doses, *are too small.*"

2. "The improper selection of a drug."

3. "The too great haste in administering a new dose."

Whether it is superfluous and out of season to remind homœopathists of *these* doctrines and warnings of the great master and observer, I shall leave all true homœopathists to decide; suffice it to say, that it is precisely in regard to the first and third rule that modern practitioners have placed themselves in contradiction with Hahnemann.

Some years ago, when a schism broke out in the Homœopathic School, and it seemed as if the doctrine of the specifics promulgated by Griesselich and Co., had achieved a complete victory over the so-called Hahnemannism, that portion of the school who had remained faithful to the truth, and who were loath to indulge in literary cudgellings, withdrew from the scene of action, hoping for better days; they left the field to the loquacious scribes of the new sect, who seemed to take an especial pride and pleasure in denying the rules of practice which the author of homœopathy had established from long experience and observation. In the place of the *Organon*, which the conscientious and eminently-qualified Hahnemann had been uninterruptedly purifying and remodelling for a space of thirty years, they read the *Organon* of Rau, which had started up like a fungus and disappeared as fast; and in place of the doctrines contained in the work on *Chronic Disease*, results of twenty years' experience, they studied the hypotheses and contradictions promulgated in the ephemeral pages of the *Hygea*. Who can deny or be astonished that, in consequence of the pernicious doctrines of that journal, the Homœopathic School in Germany lost a considerable portion of the ground which the original disciples of Hahnemann had conquered with so much honor and perseverance? For almost every homœopathic practitioner was more or less carried away by the whirlpool, and I myself am indebted for my speedy return to the doctrines of true experience and science to the warning of my never-to-be-forgotten teacher and faithful friend, who taught me in an uninterrupted series of letters to distinguish truth from falsehood by careful experiments, comparisons, and unprejudiced observations.

Many must have shared my doubts, but have probably been freed from them more slowly than I have; for the number of those who repel the errors that have been introduced in our school, and who defend against the original and only true doctrines

of the master, is increasing from day to day; a year ago scarcely any one dared speak in their favor. The impertinent, bold, and frequently vulgar tone of the specifics had intimidated even the most capable and most experienced disciples of Hahnemann to such an extent that they not only kept their better convictions to themselves (oh, the miserable cowards! H.), but, out of fear of the strong-doses men, did not hesitate to advise that great cures by means of the smallest and rarest doses should be kept concealed.

During this period of weakness and ignominy, when I should have been so glad to fight openly for the truth, together with the honorable men who shared my faith and my convictions, circumstances had set in which had prevented me from fighting an open battle for truth and justice. My contributions to some numbers of this journal had therefore to be published anonymously. This induced a few mean opponents, although the editors of the *Archiv* named me afterwards as the author of those publications, to doubt the truth of my simple narrations, although I can at any time prove the facts by my journals. If I felt grieved by the proceedings of my opponents, it is not because they attacked my honor and good name—such attacks cannot injure me—but they were evidence of the great doctrine of true homœopathy in Germany, where cures were doubted which had formerly been credited, even at a time when the homœopathic doctrine was much less advanced than it is now.

Unless the signs deceive me, we are now at the commencement of a new epoch, marked by the death of our master, whose genius hovers around us—an epoch when the unity of the school shall be restored, when the excrescences shall have been chopped off, and the genuine metal separated from the dross. Let us henceforth be more firmly united, all of us who desire the good; but let us exclude from our ranks with unrelenting severity any one who sneers at the good cause, schismatics and all those who attempt substituting opinions and hypotheses for careful observations. But let us at the same time honor the memory of the great reformer in medicine, by subjecting his doctrines, results of fifty years' observation, to repeated and comprehensive examinations and trials, and by candidly communicating our experience to one another. This would be the best mode of preparing the monument which the great man has merited by the services he has rendered to suffering humanity.

PRECAUTIONARY RULE, No. 1.

Smallness of the Dose.

The debates relative to the smallness of the doses are far from being closed. The

more that has been written on that subject for some years past, the more contradiction has been heaped upon contradiction. What is a truly remarkable circumstance in this discussion—a circumstance which is by no means creditable to the opponents of the small doses—is the fact that the manner in which Hahnemann gradually arrived at the introduction of the small doses in practice, in consequence of repeated trials, observations, experience, seems either to have been forgotten or entirely ignored. It is therefore high time to recall the opinions and precepts of the old master once more to mind.

My readers will certainly dispense me with the trouble to show by the *Organon*, from the first to the fifth edition, that it is experience, and nothing else, which led the carefully-observing author of that immortal text-book to that minuteness of doses which has now become an object of derision to the specifics.

In the second edition of "Chronic Diseases," after having spoken of homœopathic exacerbations, Hahnemann continues thus: "If the original symptoms of the disease continue with the same intensity in the succeeding days as in the beginning, or if this intensity increases, this is a sure sign that, although the remedy may be homœopathic, yet the magnitude of the dose will make the cure impossible. The remedial agent, by its powerful and disproportionate action, not only neutralizes its genuine homœopathic effects, *but establishes, moreover, in the system a medicinal disease by the side of the natural disturbance*, which is even strengthened by the medicine."

That portion of the preceding quotation which is printed in italics embodies a great truth which has never been denied, which has been abundantly confirmed by the numerous results of the allopathic treatment of chronic diseases, and is therefore well worthy of attentive and serious consideration. Such results are even witnessed in the comparatively easy treatment of syphilis, from abuse of *Mercury*, which is then termed secondary syphilis; but especially do we witness them in the treatment of primary itch, with excessive quantities of *Sulphur* internally, and *Mercury* externally, which begets a monstrous chronic disease, which, in most cases, would even be inaccessible to homœopathy without *Causticum* or *Sepia*.

Hahnemann continues afterwards: "This pernicious effect of too large a dose may be observed already in the first sixteen, eighteen, or twenty days of its action. In such a case it becomes necessary either to give an antidote, or if the antidote should not be known, to administer a very small dose of such an antipsoric as corresponds most homœopathically to the symptoms of both the natural and the artificial disease. If one antipsoric should not be sufficient,

another one, of course, ought to be given, after having been selected with the same care."

To confirm this rule, and as a proof that it had been drawn from experience, the acute observer adds, in a note: "The accident above alluded to, and which is very much in the way of a cure and cannot be sufficiently guarded against, I have witnessed in my own practice, at the time when I was not yet fully acquainted with the remedial virtues of *Sepia*, and especially *Lycopodium* and *Silicea*. I was then in the habit of giving four, five, or six globules of the billionth potency at a dose. *Discite moniti*." What specific, endowed with the acute powers of observation which characterized the genius of Hahnemann, has ever been able to give the lie to his master's teachings in regard to the magnitude of doses, by defeating Hahnemann's experience by his own? As long as Hahnemann has not been convicted of error, I should say that it is a gratuitous and foolish indiscretion to substitute a different practice for his own, and even to demand that the experience of a few rash innovators should be credited more than that of Hahnemann, backed by the experience of a host of able and devoted practitioners of the homœopathic healing art.

How little an excessive dose is capable of displaying its full curative powers may be seen from the following remarks of the author of homœopathy:—"The excessive action of the otherwise homœopathic remedial agent having been subdued by the proper antidote or by antipsoric remedies, the same agent may then be exhibited again, but of a *much higher potency*, and in a *more minute dose*." But this agent would have no effect, if a first powerful dose of it had accomplished in the beginning all the good that the agent is capable of.

Finally, Hahnemann observes: "Nothing is lost by giving even smaller doses than those which I have indicated. *The doses can be scarcely too much reduced* provided the effects of the remedy are not disturbed by improper food. The remedial agent will act even in its smallest quantity, provided it corresponds perfectly to all the symptoms of the disease, and its action is not interfered with by dietetic transgressions. The advantage of giving the smallest doses is this, *that it is an easy matter to neutralize their effects in case the medicine should not have been chosen with the necessary exactitude*. This being done, a more suitable antipsoric may be exhibited." This advice ought to be carefully considered, especially by beginners, together with the warning which Hahnemann has expressed in the preface to his work on the Chronic Diseases. "What would they have risked, if they had first followed my indications and had employed

small doses? The worst which could have befallen them was, that those doses would be of no avail. It was impossible that they should do any harm. But instead of exhibiting small doses, they employed, from a want of sense, and of their own accord, large doses for homœopathic use, thus exposing the lives of their patients, and arriving at truth by that circuitous route which I had travelled upon before them with trembling hesitation, but the end of which I had just reached with success. Nevertheless, after having done much mischief, and having squandered the best period of their lives, they were obliged, when they were really desirous of curing a disease, to resort to the only true method which I had demonstrated to them a long while ago."

I should weary the patience of my readers if I were to continue this subject still further. He who is desirous of having an accurate knowledge of my views about the matter of the doses, may read my work, entitled "Homœopathia, for Intelligent Laymen." At page 203 of this work, a special chapter has been devoted to the "*smallness of the doses*," which I feel bound to approve of even now, after many years' experience, and after having suffered myself to be carried away for a time by the hue and cry against the small doses, and having prescribed larger ones with much less success, especially in the treatment of chronic diseases. The reasons for my adhering to the small doses may be found in my Journal, which has now grown up to fifty-five large quarto volumes, and in my communications to the *Archiv*, signed "Dr. B. of D."

I ought to observe here that Hahnemann has never deviated from this practice of giving small doses, even in the last years of his practice, and that the insinuations of the specifics to that effect are totally without foundation.

These insinuations are not only contradicted in the preface to the "Chronic Diseases," which was written at the end of 1838, but I can likewise show their falsehood by the letters which have been exchanged between Hahnemann and myself, without any interruption, from the middle of the year 1830 until two months before his death, and which show that, so far from increasing the doses, Hahnemann has, on the contrary, steadily diminished them progressively until the last moment.

Inasmuch as we know almost nothing of the cures performed by our defunct master, except the two cases reported in the preface to the second volume of the "*Materia Medica Pura*," and a few more facts which had been but slightly touched upon, I may perhaps afford a pleasure to most homœopaths, by communicating an extract from Hahnemann's Journal, which he sent to me

on the 24th of April, 1844, as a proof of the efficacy of small doses. Wherever this potency is not distinctly indicated in the report, the reader will please to understand the 60th.

Case.—O., actor, thirty-three years old, married.

January 14th, 1843. Has been frequently troubled with an affection of the throat for several years past; has a new attack, which lasted already for a month. When swallowing saliva, he feels a stinging sensation, tight and sore feeling.

When the throat is not affected he suffers with a fissure in the anus, painfully smarting; the anus is then swollen, inflamed, and narrower than usual; the expulsion of the fæces is very difficult under these circumstances, and is accompanied by the protrusion of hemorrhoids.

Bell. x°, dissolved in seven tablespoonfuls of water, one tablespoonful to be mixed in a tumblerful of water; one teaspoonful of this last mixture at a dose.

15th. The sore throat was worse in the evening.

16th. The sore throat had disappeared, but the affection of the anus had returned. Painful stool in the evening.

He confessed that he had had a chancre eight years ago, the removal of which by cauterization had even followed by the above-named symptoms.

On the 10th of January, he took *Merc. viv.*, one pellet, prepared and taken as above.

January 20th. Sore throat had almost gone. Anus improved; feels yet some soreness after the stools: pulsations, swelling, and inflammation had disappeared. The narrowing was less.

Merc. viv., one pellet, of the second higher dynamization, prepared in the same way as before, and taken in the morning. (It is not stated whether the *Mercury* was taken once or twice; generally only once in the morning.)

25th. Throat almost well, but smarting pain and *violent stitches* in the anus; violent pain in the anus after stool; some narrowing and heat.

30th. Last dose (one teaspoonful) in the afternoon. On the 28th the anus was better; the *sore throat had returned*; the smarting in the throat was pretty violent.

One pellet in sugar of milk, dissolved as above, and taken for seven days, one teaspoonful a day.

February 7th. Considerable ulcerative pain in the throat. Colic; good stools, but several in succession, with great thirst. The anus is perfectly well.

Sulphur, one pellet of the second potency, in seven tablespoonfuls, as above.

13th. Had an ulcerative pain in the throat, especially when swallowing the saliva, which he now secretes in abundance,

especially on the 11th and 12th. The anus has become a little narrower, especially since yesterday.

Smelled of *Mercury*, and took *Merc. viv.*, second highest potency, one pellet to be dissolved in seven tablespoonfuls of water, to which was added half a tablespoonful of brandy; mix one tablespoonful in a tumbler. full of water, and take one teaspoonful as above.

20th. The throat has been better since the 18th; great pains in the anus; stool is painful when passing it; thirst decreased.

Sugar of milk in seven tablespoonfuls, etc.

March 3d. No sore throat. When passing the stools, an empty hemorrhoidal tumor makes its appearance, with itching of the part, (formerly with burning and smarting).

Smelling of *Ac. nitr.* and sugar of milk in seven tablespoonfuls, etc.

20th. The pain after the stool has almost gone; yesterday he passed some blood with the stool (old symptom). The throat is sound; there is a slight sensation when drinking cold.

Smelling of *Ac. nitr.* (Smelling is performed by opening a little phial containing half an ounce of diluted alcohol or brandy, and smelling for one or two moments of a pellet which has been dissolved in it.)

Remained well ever since.

(To be continued.)

THE PRACTICE OF HAHNEMANN.

The article by Dr. Von Bönninghausen should be thoroughly studied by every student of homœopathy. Hahnemann's *Organon*, we are sorry to say it, is neglected by the medical student. Many, we have reason to believe, have never seen that work, and thereby remain ignorant of homœopathy.

The flood of "domestic" works and others for homœopathic practice, written and published chiefly, as it seems to us, for pecuniary profit, are too often regarded the standards of Hahnemann's system. We never could see the pretended necessity for these works. But we do see their pernicious effects, the promulgation of spurious for the genuine doctrine and practice of homœopathy. Not only are these works used in families, but even some practitioners rely alone on them. We doubt if there be an agent more efficient in retarding the progress of pure homœopathy than these "domestic" works. Nearly all of them are

based on allopathic doctrine, which never harmonizes in any measure with homœopathy.

The only reliable works are Hahnemann's *Organon*, and his *Chronic Diseases*, including his *Materia Medica Pura*. Without a thorough knowledge of these, no one is competent to treat diseases homœopathically. Dr. Bönninghausen, in our opinion, is the ablest practitioner of the school. He speaks "the words of truth and soberness." There is nothing wild in him; he is no visionary; he has the regular exercise of dispassionate reason; and what he says, is in the highest degree practical. He has great mental force, which shows itself in the clearness of his thoughts; and because of their distinctness to his own mind, he is able to express them in the most appropriate words, which give them convincing influence on the mind of the student. Bönninghausen knew the mind of Hahnemann, up to within a short period of his death; and although the world has been unjustly deprived of the records of the experience and opinions of that great man, in the last years of his life, yet his correspondence with Bönninghausen shows an important fact, that instead of enlarging the dose of medicine, as recommended in his *Organon*, he diminished it in chronic diseases, in which affections, we admit, is to be found most of his experience. For that reason, his experience becomes the more valuable, for by far the greater number of the human family suffer of chronic affections. It is encouraging to perceive, as we think we do, "that better times are coming;" for both in Europe and in this country, physicians have begun to examine more critically what Hahnemann did teach, and to put his rules of practice to the test by experiment. This should have been the work of every professed disciple of his for the last forty years; but many are led astray by Rau and others, and persevering efforts were made by industrious and powerful minds to form a bond of union between homœopathy and allopathy; and so confident were they of success, and so great an influence did they exert, that had it not have been for Gross, Stapf, Bönninghausen, and a few others, the prognostications of allopaths would have been realized, in the overthrow

of homœopathy in Europe, and it would have been merged into modified allopathy. Had not the allopathic school been overrun with pride, vanity, ignorance and duplicity, it would have seized upon Rau's doctrines, made them popular by their adoption, and in that way, they could have carried a large proportion of the pretended homœopathists into their schools, and made them communicants at the allopathic altar. But the Protector of truth directed otherwise, and the day is at hand, when the labors of Hahnemann will be duly appreciated, and pure homœopathy triumph. In this country the genuine disciples of that great man are on the increase. We know of those who were once mongrels, but have come out of darkness into the light; and from numerous letters received by us during the last year, we learn the cheering fact, that this Journal has contributed in aid of so desirable a work.

MEDICAL REFORM.

A reform in the healing art is now in progress, which is deeper and more thorough than the world has ever yet beheld. There is an uprooting of old theories, and the dangerous practice founded upon them. So complete is this, that many of the ablest members of the profession in this and other countries absolutely refuse to prescribe any thing that has the slightest tincture of allopathy; not from partizan feeling, not from obstinacy, but from an honest conviction, based upon positively-known facts of its evil tendency. Although allopathists yet smile in derision at the idea of the spread of homœopathy, nevertheless these "blind leaders of the blind" cannot resist the tide that sets in in favor of that system. It is to our mind an encouraging fact, that homœopathists generally are investigating thoroughly the principles and rules of practice promulgated by Hahnemann; and the influence which Rau, Griesselich, and others, had in turning aside many from pure homœopathy is rapidly passing away, and the doctrines and practice of the master are rising in the estimation of the industrious practical student.

Notwithstanding these encouraging views of the progress of a reform in medicine,

yet much remains to be accomplished. The laity are full of erroneous notions in regard to the treatment of diseases; their minds are influenced by allopathic nonsense, which should be removed, and can be done only by firmness on the part of practitioners, who, in no case, should depart from a strict adherence to the established rules of practice. Unless such a course be pursued at all hazards, having a greater love for truth and humanity than for money or transient fame, the practitioner will meet with difficulties from the laity in a faithful performance of his duties, that will greatly endanger the lives of the sick. The attempt is often made to take the treatment of cases out of the hands of the physician, leaving him nothing but the responsibility. "Doctor, John has not had a motion of his bowels since day before yesterday, and you have not given him anything to act on his bowels." The doctor says, "my dear sir, you forget that John had a free DIARRHŒA for three days and nights, which was arrested day before yesterday, and no symptoms present show he suffers for want of an evacuation from the bowels." "Yes! yes! I understand you, doctor, but I have an opinion of my own, sir, on that subject, and unless John has a movement of the bowels in a few hours, I shall insist on giving him a cathartic." "But," says the doctor, "an irritation of the bowels by a cathartic might be injurious to him." "I don't believe it, doctor." This is but a slight example of the mode by which laymen, who have no true ideas of medicine, undertake to direct the physician in his duties, yet hold him responsible for the result. If laymen are determined to direct the medical treatment of the sick, they should inform themselves on the subject, that they may be qualified for the fearful work.

We can never have such a reform in medicine as is demanded for the safety of the sick, unless suitable measures are employed to enlighten the people. They should know, that prescribing for diseases should be governed by established rules, and that it is reasonable to expect injury by a deviation from them. They should know, in the next place, that by a comparison of one case of disease with another, however striking the resemblance, it does not

follow that the same measures are appropriate to both. This is the basis of quackery, and such an error is the hope of the quack. However, it is a cheering consideration, that the people are rapidly acquiring knowledge, which after a while will lead them to a true estimate of a physician's services, and confidence existing, will lead to an avoidance of all interference, and the practitioner will be able to perform his duties with a satisfaction not common in these days.

ERROR CORRECTED.

The *Boston Homœopathic Journal* is at fault in representing that the two gentlemen named in an article in the last number, were the only practitioners of homœopathy in this city in 1833. One did not graduate until 1835, and the other, we believe, left practice from somewhere in the neighborhood of 1833, and did not resume it until 1839. Announcements like that in the *Boston Journal* we have seen several times, to our surprise, during the last few years, not only in medical journals, but also in newspapers. The *New Quarterly* perpetrated a similar blunder, which we passed unnoticed at the time, for it was so near home that we feared our remarks might have been misconstrued.

In 1833, Hans B. Gram, M.D., the first Homœopathist in America, and we believe he was also a native of Boston; A. D. Wilson, M.D., and William Channing, M.D., were the only ones known to the public, then in the active duties of homœopathic practitioners. The Editor of this Journal had been investigating homœopathy under Dr. Gram from 1830, and although he openly treated the *Cholera* in 1832 homœopathically, yet he did not allow himself to be recognised as a homœopathist, for several years after that epidemic.

These remarks are made in good feeling, being prompted alone by a sense of justice to the dead as well as to the living.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS AND OTHERS.

The present number of this Journal completes the Seventh Volume. The first number of the Eighth Volume will be published on the 1st of May next. Subscribers would oblige us much, if they would, on the

receipt of this number, remit to us one dollar, for the next volume, that we may have some indication of the number of copies necessary to issue to meet the demand.

Eight copies can be had for five dollars. Twenty copies for ten dollars. Fifty copies for twenty dollars.

So far as we are personally concerned we have no complaint, because our services in conducting this Journal have met with an encouragement from the friends of Homœopathy far beyond our expectations. It has been sustained; and, although, after paying the expense of publication, only a few hundreds are left us for pocket-money, yet the amount is satisfactory; but we would not object to an increase of it, on the ground that five, ten, or twenty dollars expended by each physician for the purpose of an extended circulation of the *American Journal of Homœopathy* among the people, would pay them a very large dividend. We know this would be so, for it has been proved by experience.

PAMPHLETS, PERIODICALS, ETC.

Introductory Lecture by Prof. W. S. HELMUTH, to the class in the Homœopathic Medical College of Pennsylvania. Published by the class.

Those who take morbid alterations of structure as found in dead bodies for a guide in the treatment of diseases, might be convinced of their error by a thorough reading of this lecture.

Essays on Asylums for persons of unsound mind by JOHN M. GALT, M.D., Superintendent and Physician of the Eastern Lunatic Asylum of Virginia, at Williamsburgh.

This pamphlet contains two articles. The 1st, "On the organization of Asylums for the Insane." The 2d, "On the Medico-legal question of the confinement of the insane." These contain several valuable practical suggestions. We hope to see the day when able and pure homœopathists will be placed in charge of these institutions in our country. When the doctrine advocated and proved by Hahnemann on chronic diseases is understood generally, lunacy will be better understood than at present. In truth, it is not improper to say, that allopathists do not know the constitutional conditions of lunatics; their knowledge embraces only some of the exciting causes of insanity.

AN
ADDRESS ON HOMŒOPATHIA,

DELIVERED IN THE
ASSEMBLY ROOM, BALTIMORE, MD.,

On Wednesday Evening, May 19, 1852,

BY S. R. KIRBY, M.D.,

OF NEW-YORK.

~~~~~  
Published by Order of the American Institute of Homœopathy.  
~~~~~

NEW-YORK:
ANGELL, ENGEL & HEWITT, PRINTERS,
No. 1 SPRUCE STREET.

1852.

THE HISTORY OF THE

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

ADDRESS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

The Constitution of the American Institute of Homœopathy provides for a public address to be delivered at the place of its annual meeting, to which the public in general are invited. It is proper, then, that the tenor of my remarks should be popular in their character. Until within a few years past lectures on medicine addressed to the people were discountenanced by physicians, having been considered a kind of advertising, derogatory to the profession. But the views and feelings of physicians have changed in this respect, and popular lectures on the science and art of medicine are often delivered, and the most eminent practitioners are sometimes selected by medical associations for this duty.

About five years ago, in the city of New York, the New York Academy of Medicine, composed of most of the allopaths of that city, was organised, and among other things, it avowed the purpose of adopting suitable measures for arresting the progress of Homœopathia, and commenced its operations by a popular address, selecting one of the most eminent and learned of the profession to deliver it; and using extraordinary efforts, secured an audience of upwards of four thousand persons. This Academy has a special charter from the State of New York, and is looked upon by allopathic physicians as one of the most influential institutions of the profession in this country. Therefore its doings should be received as indicating the views and feelings of the allopathic school in general. The doings, then, of the New York Academy of Medicine, approved directly or indirectly by other allopathic associations in our country, have referred the matter in controversy among medical men to the people. The homœopathic school have taken up the gauntlet thus thrown down to it, and the appeal is now fairly before the people, which is right and proper; and most willingly will we submit to this tribunal. An individual may cling to error all his days; but not so the people in mass, for among them, there is a sort of inherent, self-correcting power, a "sober second thought," which corrects errors, and produces that, we all seek and all fear at the same time, *public opinion*; the sovereignty of which in this country we all acknowledge. It is necessary, then, for a right understanding of this controversy, that its merits should be clear-

ly set forth, and the people being enlightened thereon, may fairly judge between Allopathy and Homœopathy. Quackery thrives best in ignorance. Therefore I say again, enlighten the people. Let them know that costiveness can never be *cured* by cathartics, and purgative medicines will not be used. Let the people understand that there is no such thing as tonic medicine; and they will no longer poison themselves and become weak by taking drugs, vainly expecting by them to gain strength. If the fact be universally known that drugs destroy life sooner than other agents, except lightning and mechanical injuries, few persons would be foolhardy enough to indulge in their daily use, either in small or large doses. Inform the people that it is absurd to suppose that a drug "can do no harm if it do no good," and we shall hear that pernicious saying no more. If it be known that to cure quickly is sometimes not to cure at all, and the knowledge and skill of a physician would not be estimated by his pretension to effect rapid cures. If the people knew that by violent medication a revulsive effect is likely to happen, and thereby a healthy organ become diseased, which is the fact in thousands who are afflicted with chronic affections, and large and repeated doses of drugs would be refused. This is a truth of the highest importance, and there is too much reason to believe that physicians themselves have not investigated it as its importance, in my humble opinion, demands. The many who are suffering of chronic maladies might trace the origin of their sickness to large and repeated doses of drugs; and sometimes they admit it to be so, but add fuel to the fire by daily doses of compounds, prepared they know not of what, nor by whom. I do not mean to say that the allopathic school denies this doctrine, on the contrary, it admits it; but I do mean to say that, practically, physicians of that school reject it; they even seek to cure diseases by transferring, through the powerful poisonous effects of drugs, the existing disease in one part of the human body to another part that is healthy. This will not be denied by intelligent practitioners of that school. If it is, we refer for proof to the practice of irritating the bowels by drastic purgatives to relieve a disease in the head; to the application of blisters to relieve an internal inflammation. The use of issues and setons are on the same principle. Moreover, the administration of *Mercury*, in the form of calomel or blue pill, for slight affections, which would, if left alone, go off spontaneously, may awake a slumbering consumption in those predisposed to that disease. This is subversion with a vengeance. So also will *Quinine* do irreparable mischief in healthy organs if administered in large and repeated doses, as may be seen in many persons who have had *intermittent fever*, and relied on that drug for a cure.

In relation to Mercury I will remark further, that it has the effect to suppress a disease, or palliate it, and so much so, that the sick are deceived by it, and suppose themselves improved because their sufferings have changed. So certain in this respect is Mercury, in the usual doses of the old school, that it is prescribed in that school on almost all occasions, and the people are so accustomed to its use by physicians, that they do not hesitate to take it without advice. Druggists, too, dispense

it to the sick, little knowing the evil they may do. It was Hahnemann who discovered that Mercury, above all drugs, had the power to palliate almost all diseases and render them in many, very many instances utterly incurable. The people have begun to understand the pernicious effects of Mercury, but still there is much for them to learn of it. It is but just that I should state, that a number of the more intelligent of the allopathic school have expressed in strong terms their disapprobation of the ordinary use of *Mercury* in diseases.

It is a fact scarcely as yet thought of by the people, and too little regarded even by physicians, that many of the drugs in common use continue their action in the human system for a long time, and of all the errors into which individuals run, none is more prominent than assigning the true cause of their diseases. Physicians themselves attempt, in this respect, what they can rarely accomplish, for to determine with certainty the cause of individual maladies requires more knowledge than is yet possessed by man. Although this be so, yet since the trial of drugs upon healthy persons by Hahnemann and his disciples, diseases caused by drugs, and natural diseases modified by them, may be detected with much accuracy. In this connection, another fact should be known, which is, that a curable disease, by mismanagement of the remedy in giving too large a dose, or repeating it too often in small ones, may defeat the object intended, and render the case incurable. There is reason to believe this often happens in incipient consumption, the only stage of that disease in which the intelligent and honest physician dares to express encouragement of a cure. The people should be made to know that a large proportion of the incurable chronic diseases should be attributed mainly to the mismanagement of acute ones in the use of drugs. Another fact should not be overlooked, that drugs are *certain* in their effects in the human system, and when one is administered which is inappropriate to the existing disease, the cure of that disease is made more difficult and uncertain when, if afterwards, the real remedy is given. I assert that this is true, perceived dimly by the more observing among allopaths, but by the most of them never thought of; but the true homœopath observes the utmost caution to avoid the administration of an inappropriate drug, for full well he knows the mischief he may cause thereby, even by the "small doses."

I desire to urge upon your attention another very important thing, which is, that the cure of diseases depends not upon the names which nosologists may have given them. If this was understood as it should be, advertisements of remedies for diseases by name would receive no notice, and the traffic in patent medicines would come to an end.

In homœopathic practice the popular opinion is, that the "small doses" can be taken with impunity, but it is now established by the most careful experiments that the attenuated drugs of Hahnemann do influence the vital organism, and it is believed by many, much more profoundly than has heretofore been supposed. Those homœopathic practitioners in every part of the world who habitually use the 30th attenuation of drugs, and even more highly attenuated, must have good reason

for urging great caution in the repetition of the "small doses," especially in chronic diseases. They assert that the attenuated drugs are certain in their effects, and what is sometimes assumed as pure diseased actions uninfluenced in any measure by "the small doses," are in fact the effects of drugs which had been given, powerfully acting upon a highly sensitive person, so much so, in some cases, as to accelerate death. Of late our opponents, the old school physicians, do not hesitate to say that in their opinion the doses of drugs used by homœopaths do produce effects in the human system, and they state further, that in their opinion those doses are not without danger. I shall not deny this opinion of our opponents, for there may be truth in it. But this admission does not help them, nor is it in any sense a reasonable argument against Homœopathia. Prove that attenuated drugs may be taken by diseased persons in almost any quantity, one drug after another at short intervals, and that for weeks and months, without danger, and an irresistible argument is furnished to overthrow the claim that is set up for those drug preparations. But of this I have no fears, for there are too many living competent witnesses in the profession who, by the most thorough and careful experiments, have proved that the doses of Hahnemann can effect medicinal power in the living organism. Therefore the people should know that the "small doses" are efficacious, that they may not, under the idea that the quantity is so small that no harm can come by their too frequent repetition, be led to take them without due precaution.

I am aware that what I have presented thus far will not be received at once, for it is hardly possible for you to divest your minds of views of the healing art which have been gradually introduced from your infancy. I am not yet vain enough to suppose that I am about, in this single address, to convince any one of you that Allopathy is false and that Homœopathy is true. I have had too much experience of the ways of men, to anticipate any such result; but I do expect your candid consideration of the few things we offer, and that you will endeavor to investigate Homœopathia with a view to ascertain if it be true.

When Hahnemann made known his discoveries, the doctrine and practice he taught were so unlike those universally received by the profession, that, like most new truths, they were rejected. He appealed to the standard works of medicine; he appealed to the experience of practitioners for ages; he showed that the principles he advocated had been seen as through a dark glass from Hippocrates down to his own time. He showed that those drugs which by experience had been found to cure complaints with such certainty as to secure to them the appellation of *specifics*, went to establish the law of cure "*similia similibus curantur*." Hahnemann concealed nothing. He made known the experiments which led him to the discovery of the law of cure, and that attenuated drugs in amazingly small quantities were the most safe and certain to cure diseases. But all this did not avail. It was too great a sacrifice to throw away the learning and experience of ages. There was too much personal interest at stake. The apothecary saw his interest directly affected, and he was the first to raise the standard of opposition.

The elder members of the profession were well nested in the confidence of the people with ample supplies for their wants, together with a natural aversion to innovations in medicine, especially when what they believed in and practiced had the stamp of antiquity upon it; they sneeringly smiled, and inquired, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth? Can anything worthy our notice come from the little town of Meissen?" But when the *people* began to consult Hahnemann and his disciples for their complaints, and when remarkable cures were effected upon the most intelligent and influential, then the opposition waxed more and more wrathful. All sorts of evil things were said of Hahnemann and of his colleagues. When it was found that wholesale denunciation of Homœopathia and its author, and all who had anything to do with him and it, availed nothing, then various medical associations took up the matter, and undertook to reason upon it. The mode of reasoning is very well expressed in a fable which was written by a friend of mine, and which serves my purpose better than anything I can produce.

"An ass, heavily laden with a sack of letters directed to a distant town on the river, was met on his way by a fox, who apprised him that ease and expedition would both be promoted, by transferring his burden to a steamer which had just then stopped at the shore."

"This is unreasonable, friend Reynard," replied the patient beast; "for my method of transporting the mail has been in operation three thousand years, yours only fifty. It is impossible that the combined wisdom of so many generations should not exceed that of one."

"Your reasoning," replied the fox, "can have no weight, unless there had been a race or races between steamboats and asses during the said three thousand years, and it had been decided that the ass always gained the race and was less fatigued. Now this trial of speed and strength must have been impossible before steamboats were invented."

Whilst the mail carrier of the old line was staggering under the weight of this argument, and that of his letters, another ass overtook him, and having overheard the conversation, was enabled to bring timely aid to the confounded disputant. "Master Reynard," quoth he, "you are not of an age and size rightly to decide such matters. Your facts and arguments may be unanswerable; but they should have no weight with any respectable ass. No respectable and learned ass should ever adopt the new method, until some other ass, still more respectable and more learned, shall have previously adopted it."

"It puzzles my brain," replied the fox, "to apply this rule to any useful purpose; I pity your hopeless condition. The practices of the respectable and learned asses could never be reformed, if each must wait till some ass more learned and respectable than himself should have set the example." The moral of this is, The idol of one man is antiquity; that of another is respectability. The former rejects whatever was not in ages before him; the latter, whatever is not in the circle above him. The man who prefers caste to truth, and spurns useful discoveries not sanctioned by the head or the tail of some academy or fashionable clique, can only be pitied. But the man who venerates the shade of

antiquity, and in matters even of science and art is awed into ultra-conservatism by long-established opinion and usage, is entitled to some instruction. He does not consider that the *non-adoption* of undiscovered facts and unheard opinions is not equivalent to their *rejection*. There are many facts, and inferences from them, which former ages neither adopted nor rejected; and simply because they never so much as dreamed either of the possibility of the facts or of the conclusions to which their future discovery would necessarily lead every sound and unprejudiced mind. *For example*, "Homœopathia is fifty years old. The physicians of former ages never rejected Homœopathia, for it was not known. They never made any homœopathic attenuations, and consequently never dreamed of instituting any comparison between their efficacy and that of crude drugs. Homœopathia was never rejected until the time of Hahnemann."

Homœopathia is the only scientific system of medicine ever promulgated. It is not a theory, it is made up of facts, so arranged as to be understood, and applied in practice.

Homœopathia embraces the *treatment* of diseases. It has a law of cure, and it has a Materia Medica; the one is adapted to the other. Homœopathia is a complete system in itself. It is independent of theories of disease; however these may change they do not disturb it. The cure of diseases homœopathically does not arise from their received theories, but it is in its nature independent of them; and in this we have the essential difference from Allopathy. The latter invariably seeks the indication of cure from the theory of the nature of the disease. For example, the theory is, that a part inflamed has too much blood in it; from this theory, the indication is, to diminish the quantity of blood by venesection, although experience proves that inflammations are cured more certainly and safely without extracting blood. I will dwell a moment on the mode of acquiring a knowledge of diseases in the two schools. In the allopathic, of late years, dead human bodies are examined, and whatever injury may be discovered is set down as showing the character of the disease of which the person died. Now, this does not show the character of the disease, it shows, it is true, the injury of parts in the body examined, but whether it be purely the result of the disease, or the effects of drugs, or both, is not developed by such investigations. Although the information thus acquired is interesting, and such investigations have been prosecuted with great industry, nevertheless the treatment of diseases does not seem to have improved thereby. Allopathists undertake to make the disorganisations of solid parts of human bodies, ascertained after death, a guide to the treatment of cases which they suppose to be similar, and by so doing, we may see how blunders are so often made by them in determining the character of a disease; and how their treatment so frequently fails, and so often becomes pernicious. All this arises from forming a theory of cure out of a theory of disease, which is the basis of allopathic practice, and which must in the nature of things be uncertain and unsafe, as the people know from experience and observation.

We said Homœopathia is a system of facts, and strictly speaking it is not a theory at all. She embraces all actual knowledge of diseases, but passes by everything that is doubtful; she does not undertake to employ in the great work of curing the sick a baseless theory—a thing that is the result of an active imagination, of a poetic fancy. The language of Homœopathia is, “The unprejudiced observer (however great may be his powers of penetration), aware of the futility of all elaborate speculations that are not confirmed by experience, perceives in each individual affection nothing but changes of the state of the body and mind (*that is, traces of disease, casualties, symptoms,*) that are discoverable by the senses alone,—that is to say, deviations from the former sound state of health, which are felt by the patient himself, remarked by the individuals around him, and observed by the physician. The whole of these available signs taken together represent in its full extent, the disease itself,—that is, they constitute the true and only form of it which the mind is capable of conceiving.” “I cannot, therefore,” says Hahnemann, “comprehend how it was possible for physicians, without heeding the symptoms or taking them as a guide in the treatment, to imagine that they ought to search the interior of the human economy (which is inaccessible and concealed from our view), and that they could there alone discover that which was to be cured in disease. I cannot conceive how they could entertain so ridiculous a pretension as that of being able to discover the internal invisible change that had taken place, and restore the same to the order of its healthy condition by the aid of medicines, without ever troubling themselves very much about the symptoms, and that they should have regarded such a method as the only means of performing a radical and rational cure. Is not that which manifests itself in disease, by symptoms, identified with the change itself which has taken place in the human economy, and which it is impossible to discover without their aid? Do not the symptoms of disease, which are sensibly cognisable, represent to the physician the disease itself? When he can neither see the spiritual essence, the vital power which produces the disease, nor yet the disease itself, but simply perceive and learn its morbid effects, that he may treat it accordingly. What, would the old school search out farther from the hidden interior for a primary morbid cause, whilst they reject and superciliously despise the palpable and intelligible representation of the disease, the symptoms which clearly announce themselves to us as the object of cure? What is there besides these in disease which they have to cure?”

“It is not possible to conceive or prove by any experience, after the cure of the whole of the symptoms of a disease, together with all its perceptible changes, that there remains or possibly can remain any other than a healthy state, or that the morbid alteration which has taken place in the interior of the economy has not been annihilated.” It is an insult to common sense to deny this, yet allopathists say: “The homœopathist may remove the symptoms, but the disease will still remain.” I am inclined to believe, Ladies and Gentlemen, that if a physician would remove your pains and aches, your mental and bodily

sufferings, you would run the risk of what remains of the disease. This objection is highly absurd, and yet it is gravely made by learned members of the profession. The practice of Homœopathia requires that the totality of the symptoms of a disease should make known the remedy. In this, the practice of the old school and that of the new are at variance. Homœopathia stands forth, and boldly declares that, "*The whole of the symptoms taken together is the image of the malady reflected externally, which must indicate the remedy.*" The allopathic school, with all her boastings, has no means of obeying this rule. Let the most learned and most experienced in Allopathy attempt it, but it would be in vain. The reason is, that school has no *Materia Medica* worthy the name. This brings me to notice another branch of Homœopathia, which is its *Materia Medica*. Hahnemann perceived how little the profession knew of the effects of drugs upon the human system. Himself being in sound health he undertook the laborious task of taking a drug in moderate doses, and recording the effects, and he secured the services of a number of persons, also in good health, to aid him in this work. The result is the *Materia Medica Pura*, which is an imperishable monument of his fame. It can never be defaced, it is of adamant hardness, and ages will only add to its beauty, and the whole profession will yet gaze upon that monument with feelings of veneration. There is a remarkable exactness in the record made by Hahnemann of the effect of drugs in the human body, and fifty years' experience has established the truth of his experiments in the trial of drugs upon the healthy. Now, it is a remarkable fact, that drugs of themselves, taken in moderate doses, will produce symptoms which resemble those of natural diseases; because of this, a disease, which is known only by its symptoms, makes known the medicines it stands in need of; for if we look into the *Materia Medica Pura*, the symptoms of the drugs, when properly grouped, will represent a most striking resemblance to the natural disease, and whichever drug does so is the remedy—the homœopathic remedy, and it cures, promptly and safely, if administered in the appropriate dose, by that law of nature, "like is cured by like." The doctrine of Homœopathia is, that all cures are accomplished by that drug the characteristic symptoms of which are like the characteristic symptoms of the disease. This is a plain proposition, yet few comprehend it. It requires some study and attention, or the exact meaning may not be perceived. I will try to explain it, for in it is contained the gist of Homœopathia. Now, every disease, properly so called, has certain symptoms peculiar to itself, which distinguish it from all other diseases; these symptoms are usually few in number, and they are generally the most prominent and striking, and they are termed diagnostic or characteristic symptoms, that is they belong exclusively to that disease. Then there are concomitant symptoms, more numerous than the first, which may be found more or less in other diseases; then come the symptoms which have been termed the sympathetic, which are numerous and common in almost all diseases. Now, examine the *Materia Medica Pura*, and it will be found that each drug has symptoms peculiar to itself, which are characteristic of that

drug, and they are few in number ; go on in the examination, and you will find concomitant symptoms, more numerous, and occasionally found in other drugs ; then the sympathetic symptoms, which are very numerous, and almost common with other drugs. Let the characteristic symptoms of a disease correspond to the characteristic symptoms of a drug, then examine the concomitant symptoms of each, and they will strikingly resemble each other, and so also will the sympathetic, but if the latter do not, it is not of so much importance. Thus you find the remedy—the homœopathic remedy, and experience has proved that the smallest dose is the most suitable, provided soon after its administration there is a slight increase in the force of the symptoms of the disease, to be sure of which very close attention is necessary, and if allowed to act undisturbed a prompt cure will follow. I have thus, as briefly as I am able, explained Homœopathia. It will be perceived that there is no theorising in the doctrine and practice of it. As I have said, it is made up of facts, and being so, it can never change, not even by any new discovery. Nothing essential to Homœopathia is inconsistent with other laws of nature, hence the failure of every attempt to disprove it. Not an article in any journal or newspaper ; not a pamphlet or book which has been put forth in opposition to Homœopathia, but has set up a figure of the imagination—a man of straw, named it Homœopathia, and then demolished it. This is a remarkable fact, which I leave for the opposition to reflect on. In every instance of an approach to fairness in the statement of the doctrines of our system, and anything like fair reasoning, the essential principles of the system have been admitted. This was eminently so in Dr. Forbes' paper entitled, "Allopathy, Homœopathy, and Young Physic." If the law of cure be admitted, then the practice of Hahnemann, which has been ridiculed so much, must be admitted also, for the one is consistent with the other. I am amazed that physicians do not perceive this, especially those who pretend to practice homœopathically.

I have already said that I believe the allopathic school is honest in its opposition to Homœopathia. I cannot believe the members of that school either knaves or fools. I have been long enough in communication with allopathists to know something of their integrity, and a large proportion of them, I do not doubt, would renounce Allopathy and adopt Homœopathia if they were convinced of its truth. Many think they have fairly investigated it when they make the doctrines and practice of Allopathy the standard by which to judge it.

In this way, they reasonably declare that Homœopathia is absurd, and unworthy the notice of a well educated physician ; and think they do " God's service " in cautioning the people against it.

Their mode of investigating Homœopathia is wrong. They assume that it is a mere theory, and because it is not, they of course cannot but misrepresent it. This is the reason of the blunders which allopathists commit when they speak of Homœopathia. Now, if they would admit what is really true, that it is made up of facts arranged systematically for practical purposes, then the inquiry would be, are its

professed facts real facts, or otherwise? If Homœopathia is false, as allopaths declare, let them, in the legitimate way, answer that question. The answer, however, can be obtained only in one way, which is, to repeat Hahnemann's experiments. This course is plain and reasonable. Let it be understood that it is not satisfactory to have a simple declaration that I have tried Hahnemann's experiments and did not get the results he claims. We hear similar declarations daily. "We have tried Homœopathia, and it has failed," say the opposition. But this will not do. We want to know how you tried it. We want a record of your proceedings in all their minuteness, and anything short of this will not do. Persons in general judge of a system of medicine by the cures it effects. This kind of evidence should be well understood, or it may lead individuals to adopt the most pernicious practice. It is well known among physicians that persons sometimes recover of severe and dangerous diseases under the worst kind of treatment. Therefore, if a favorable result in a single case is looked upon as a test of the correctness of the treatment it received, then we should be compelled to admit that all modes of practice are equally proper. If a person be given up to die by the attending physician, and another be called in, and adopt another kind of practice, homœopathic if you please, and recovery follows; such a case by itself is not evidence of the truth of that system, nor would a dozen cases cured under such circumstances prove it true. Nor is the experience of a single physician in practice for years, sufficient evidence that the system he has adopted is the true one. The experience of one man, in medicine, amounts to but little, unless that experience is sustained by others. Some think, if they could see a very bad case treated homœopathically and recover, it would confirm them in that system; but such persons are mistaken, it would do no such thing. It is true there are many who pretend, and sincerely too, to have confidence in Homœopathia, because a friend has got well by it. But such evidence is insufficient, and frequently such persons, when brought to the test of their faith, will show that the work of conviction had not been accomplished in them; in truth, it had scarcely begun, and of course there was not a full conversion.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we cannot, by the force of the will, believe what we please, nor can we by that faculty reject what we please. If the evidence of the truth of Homœopathia be insufficient, you cannot believe in it—you cannot rely upon it. Now, I would have you know what kind and amount of evidence would, to intelligent minds, be irresistible, and prove beyond a doubt that Homœopathia is true. 1st, Many persons while in health, avoiding all unnatural food and drink, taking a drug attenuated according to the method of Hahnemann, in repeated doses several times a day until effects are produced, and carefully noting those effects as they occur, and then compare the records thus made by each individual, and if certain symptoms should be found to be uniform, however other symptoms might differ in some respects, both in kind and in number, this would be evidence that the attenuated drugs were capable of influencing the human system. This

has already been done in a very large number of drugs, some two hundred or more. Every healthy person may, with but little trouble, repeat the experiments with any drug that has been tried by others, and thus convince himself in this matter.

2d. If many regularly educated practitioners of medicine, residing in different parts of the world, treat diseases homœopathically for years, and all testify to the same successful results, such evidence should be received ; for a combination of such experience is not likely to be deceptive.

In view of such testimony, these conclusions must follow :—1st, That if so small a quantity of a drug can cause in different individuals such a degree of disturbance in vital parts, then the disturbing power must be greatly and dangerously increased by the ordinary allopathic doses.

2d. If respectable physicians in large numbers, among whom there could be no collusion, testify, after ample experience for half a century, that the attenuated drugs are the most safe and certain in the cure of disease, we are compelled to admit the truth of such evidence.

3d. It is also an undeniable fact that thousands of the people in whom Homœopathia has been tested, unite their testimony with physicians, and state that in their own persons they have experienced a prompt, safe and thorough cure of their maladies by homœopathic practice.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the kind of evidence in favor of Homœopathia which is before you and before the world ; these are the conclusions in view of it to which you must come, and nothing but prejudice, inability to reason, or self-interest, can resist the conclusion that Homœopathia is true and should command our entire confidence.

I shall soon conclude my remarks, but before I do so, I will notice a very common objection to Homœopathia, by allopathists. They say Hahnemann's system is an absurdity and a delusion. Let us examine this grave charge from such high authority. 1st, We have explained that Homœopathia is made up of facts, and that it is not a theory. Now, can such facts be absurdities ? You know they cannot. But, say our opponents, we deny your pretended facts ? Our answer is, your denial comes too late. The experiments have been repeated all over the civilised world by thousands in the profession and out of it, and not one who has carefully tested them but admits them to be *facts*. This being so, there is no absurdity, and can be no delusion.

But, say our opponents again, "In your *Materia Medica Pura* there are 1400 symptoms said to have been produced by *sulphur* ; such a statement is preposterous. One person never had that number of symptoms." I suppose not ; there is no such pretension. Let us see if anything is wrong in this. If our opponents would be a little more deliberate, and read with attention how these 1400 symptoms were obtained, I think it will appear that they are all facts too. I cannot state with certainty how many persons Hahnemann employed in the trial of

sulphur, but it was his custom to induce as many of his friends and acquaintances, both male and female, physicians and laymen, as he could, to aid him in the trial of drugs, and I should not be surprised if fifty persons or more took *sulphur* from him, and reported in writing its effects upon themselves. He rarely told those who aided him in this important work what drug they were taking. Let a dozen persons take the same drug in the same doses, and all of them will report a few symptoms almost precisely alike ; in some instances, as I have known, in the same words ; such symptoms are regarded as characteristic of the drug. Then come symptoms which one person has, and another has not ; the reason of this is not known. One will have numerous symptoms, and another comparatively few ; but as each person reports them, they are arranged and recorded, which accounts for the very large number. Is there anything absurd in this ? I think not.

Take, say six cases of *typhus fever* ; each one will have symptoms so much alike as to show the character of the disease to be the same. There will be also symptoms in one that do not appear in another. Some will have symptoms very numerous, and others not so numerous ; now record all the symptoms of each with all possible minuteness, and there may be as many, if not more, than is recorded of *sulphur*. Take a dozen persons with headache, and record all their symptoms, and the number would astonish our opponents. Allopathists are not in the habit of investigating symptoms with the minuteness of homœopaths, and consequently they do not perceive the shades of difference in symptoms. To them, a headache is a headache, and nothing more, whether the pain be sharp, dull, shooting, tearing, throbbing, darting, piercing, continuous or intermittent ; whether it be deep-seated or superficial, in the forehead, over one eye or both ; in one temple or both ; in the top of the head or back of it ; to them it is all the same—it is a headache. It is of no consequence to them whether the patient has a change in his sufferings by lying down or sitting up ; in motion or quiet ; in the house or out of doors ; after eating or before eating ; or whether it is in the morning or in the evening ; which facts are important for the homœopathist to know ; but for the allopathist, a headache is enough. Now take a dozen persons suffering of a headache, and inquire minutely the symptoms of each, and I think there would be found a number that would amaze our allopathic brethren. The fact is, Ladies and Gentlemen, our opponents allow themselves to condemn what they have never examined, which I am of the opinion approximates absurdity ; and some less charitable person than myself might insinuate that by so doing, they are guilty of injustice. But we leave that matter with you. I will conclude by giving Miss Martineau's account of the reception of Harvey's theory, on the circulation of the blood. It is in the form of a dialogue between Lords Holland, Seymour and Southampton, a clergyman and a physician :—

“One object of old Parr's going up to Court is, that Harvey may study the case, and see if he can gain hints from it for lengthening our lives.”

"But, surely," said the clergyman, "it can matter but little what Dr. Harvey concludes and gives out about the case of this old parishioner of mine, or any other case. No one can have any respect for his judgment in the face of the wild doctrine he gives out about the blood."

"Does he adhere to that?" asked Lord Southampton.

"Yes," replied Lord Holland, "he will, ere long, publish another tract upon it. It is astounding to see a man, who seems otherwise rational and sensible, lose himself on this one point. There is no making any impression upon him; he persists as quietly as if all the wise people in the world agreed with him."

"Quietly!" said Lord Seymour; "I thought he was a passionate, turbulent fellow, who thought all the world a fool but himself."

"Whatever he may think," replied Lord Holland, "he says nothing to give one such an idea; on the contrary, the most amusing and yet melancholy part of the business, is his entire complacency. He is so self-satisfied that nothing can move him."

"Dr. Oldham," said Southampton to the family physician, who sat smiling while this description of Harvey was given, "You have looked into this business, this pretended discovery, what have you to say to it?"

"But little, my Lord; it is not worth so many words as have just been spent upon it. There is not a physician in Europe who believes in this pretended discovery."

"After examination?"

"Surely, my Lord. Any announcement of a discovery made by the physician whose merits have raised him to Dr. Harvey's post, cannot but meet with attention from a profession whose business it is to investigate the facts of the human frame and constitution."

"Then known facts are against him."

"Entirely. No point, for instance, is better understood than that the arteries are occupied by the vital spirits, which are concocted in the left side of the heart, from the air and blood of the lungs."

"And what says Harvey to this?"

"He controverts it, of course. Neither the opposition of all living physicians, nor even the silence of Galen on this notion of his, has the least effect upon him. It is sad and pernicious nonsense, and ruinous to a man who, but for this madness, might have been an honor to his profession. Of course his opinions on any subject are of no value now."

"In the profession, do you mean, or out of it?"

"I believe there are a good many out of the profession who listen to him, open-mouthed, as to every professor of new doctrines; but it is an affair in which no opinions but those of physicians can be of any consequence; and, as I said, not a physician in Europe believes in Harvey's doctrine."

"It ought to be put down," said Lord Salisbury, to which the clergyman gave an emphatic assent, observing, "that in so important an affair as a great question about the human frame, false opinions must be dangerous, and ought to be put down."

510 4558

"And how is new knowledge to fare when it comes?" said Lord Southampton. "By my observations, Dr. Harvey's notion is so following the course that new knowledge is wont to run, that I could myself almost suppose it to be true. It has been called nonsense; that is the first stage. Now, if it be called dangerous, that is the next. I shall amuse myself by watching for the third. When it is said there is nothing new in it, and it was plain to all learned men before Harvey was born, I shall know how to apportion to Harvey his due honor."

"I thought, my Lord, you had held my profession in respect," said the physician, with an uneasy smile.

"Am I not doing homage to an eminent member of it, perhaps the most eminent in the world?" said Lord Southampton; "and it appears that I am rather before than behind others in doing so. There is no man, not even the greatest, who may not stand hat in hand before the wise physician; and I, for my humble part, would do even so."

This excellent scene well describes the kind of opposition such a discovery as Homœopathy has to encounter, and especially from the medical faculty.

4274 017

M

